283.02R
W672

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK II, N. Y.

Dean Hoffman Fund

CHRISTIANITY IN EARLY BRITAIN

BY THE LATE

HUGH WILLIAMS, M.A., D.D.

VICE-PRINCIPAL AND PROFESSOR OF CHURCH HISTORY
AT THE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, BALA

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
1912

283.102R
W 672

55575

HENRY FROWDE, M.A.
PUBLISHER TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
LONDON, EDINBURGH, NEW YORK
TORONTO AND MELBOURNE

PREFACE

The publication of this book has been considerably delayed by the long illness and the death of the author. Dr. Williams, however, had read the first proofs of the whole work, and was engaged on a second revision when he was incapacitated. At his request we undertook to see the work through the press. In endeavouring to discharge this duty to our lamented colleague all that we have done is to correct obvious and, for the most part, purely verbal errors.

The Lecture of which the present work is an expansion was delivered at Birkenhead, June 8, 1905, under the terms of the Davies Lecture Trust which requires its publication in book form.

We are sure that Dr. Williams would have wished us to thank the Delegates and the Readers of the Clarendon Press for their consideration and help; the scholars who, from time to time, aided him with suggestions and advice; and the Rev. J. E. Hughes, B.A., B.D., Ffestiniog, who, at his desire, drew up the Index. The publication of the book was greatly furthered by the assistance rendered to Dr. Williams by his wife.

DAVID PHILLIPS
JOHN OWEN THOMAS

The Theological College,
Bala,
Jan. 17, 1912.

EXTRACTS

FROM

THE DAVIES LECTURE TRUST DEED

'Thomas Davies, of Bootle near Liverpool, being deeply interested in the success and prosperity of the religious denomination known as the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, and being actuated by a desire to perpetuate the memory of his late father, David Davies, who was for many years a faithful and consistent member of the said denomination, lately resolved to found and endow a Lectureship to be called the Davies Lecture in connexion with the said denomination, and for that purpose, in June 1893, paid to Trustees, appointed by the General Assembly, the sum of £2,000 to produce annually the sum of £50 . . .'

'The subject of the Lecture shall be Religion. The Lecturer shall be allowed considerable latitude in the treatment of his subject. While special attention should be given to the Christian religion, it is not intended to exclude the subject of other religions . . .'

'The Lecture shall be delivered in each year during the sittings of the General Assembly of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists at one of their chapels in the place or town where such sittings shall be held . . .'

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PAGES

BRITAIN AS A PROVINCE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE . . 1–29

CHAPTER I

NON-CHRISTIAN BRITAIN 30–53

CHAPTER II

LEGENDARY ACCOUNTS OF THE COMING OF CHRISTIANITY 54–66

CHAPTER III

THE COMING AND SPREADING OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND CHURCH 67–77

CHAPTER IV

A BRITISH CHURCH OF A. D. 200 78–96

Excursus A : Extracts from Ancient Christian Writers 96–100

CHAPTER V

PERSECUTION 101–106

Excursus B : The Martyrdom of St. Alban . . . 106–109

CHAPTER VI

BRITAIN AND THE DIOCLETIAN PERSECUTION . . 110–117

CHAPTER VII

ERRONEOUS EARLY AND MEDIAEVAL VIEWS . . . 118–130

CHAPTER VIII

CONSTANTINE AND BRITAIN 131–138

CHAPTER IX

PAGES
The Council of Arles 139–150
Excursus C: The observance of Easter until the Council of Arles 150–154

CHAPTER X

The Faith of Nicaea 155–166

CHAPTER XI

New Religious Policy 167–178
The Two Tyranni: I. Maximus, A. D. 383–387. . 170
II. Constantine, A. D. 407–411 . 176

CHAPTER XII

The Church in Britain as Part of Western Christendom. (*a*) Fifth Century 179–188
(*b*) Britain and Later Conceptions . 189–195

CHAPTER XIII

Pelagianism. Pelagius. Agricola and Severianus. Palladius 196–213

CHAPTER XIV

Germanus and Lupus. Germanus and Severus . 214–233

CHAPTER XV

British Personages of the Fifth Century . . 234–251
1. Fastidius 234
2. Faustus 238
3. Riocatus 242
4. Nynias 244
5. Patrick 245

CHAPTER XVI

Monachism: Beginnings 252–264

CHAPTER XVII

British Terms indicative of Monachism . . . 265–275

CHAPTER XVIII

PAGES
Two Britains 276–294
Excursus D: British Hagiographic Literature. Vitae Sanctorum. Lives of the Saints. Bucheddau y Saint 294–305

CHAPTER XIX

Monachism in Britain: Early Years . . . 306–331
Dubricius, Dyvric 309
Iltutus, Illtud 316

CHAPTER XX

Princes and Church. Ambrosius, Maelgwn, Arthur 332–352

CHAPTER XXI

Growth of Monachism 353–362
Excursus E 363–365

CHAPTER XXII

Monachism (*continued*). The Disciples of Illtud and Others 366–403

CHAPTER XXIII

Annales Cambriae vel Annales Brittonum . . 404–416

CHAPTER XXIV

Ecclesiastical References in the Early Literature of the British Tongue 417–437

CHAPTER XXV

Two Churches 438–462

CHAPTER XXVI

Two Churches (*continued*) 463–480

Index 481–484

INTRODUCTION

BRITAIN AS A PROVINCE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

It was a few years before the middle of the first century that Britain formally began its long course of life as a Roman province. In A. D. 43 the Emperor Claudius proclaimed it a new colony, and in the following year he himself received the title of Britannicus. This event is of the greatest historical significance. Its fuller meaning for the Britain of the early centuries will be set forth later. A few facts, however, by way of introduction, may be mentioned here.

The whole island was not included within the province of Britain. If we look northward we find that the region which lies beyond the Wall of Hadrian was outside the empire. This wall, called *Vallum Hadrianum*, formed, from about A. D. 200, the permanent boundary (*limes*) of the empire in Britain. All dwelling to the south of the Roman Wall came to be called 'citizens' (*cives*), all to the north of it 'barbarians' (*barbari*). By the transition involved in its subjection to Roman dominion, Britain was brought into new and profitable relations with older provinces. In these provinces Roman institutions had become settled and familiar; learning and art flourished; above all, Christian believers and the Christian community—the Church—carried on successful evangelistic work. The influence derived from these older provinces became more pronounced as the second century advanced. Italy, Spain, Gaul, and the Rhine provinces contributed gifts to Britain from their rich stores. Among these gifts was Christianity. As showing the advantage of the incorporation, the striking fact may be recorded that the introduction of the Christian religion into parts beyond the Wall of Hadrian was late as compared with its introduction into the so-called province of Britain.

The difference between these Roman and non-Roman countries will be made clear if we take an illustration from

the time of the Council of Arles (314). Britain, that is the province, in obedience to the summons of Constantine, sent three bishops (perhaps four) with presbyters and deacons to that first great gathering of the West. But non-Roman Scotland and Ireland had no Church representatives to send; they were still heathen, while in Britain there were organized communities.

It is to the fact of Britain being Roman that we are indebted for the preservation of no small part of British history. At times when there is an utter lack of information from all native sources, Greek and Latin writers supply the want. In writing of the failures and successes of Roman officials, they incidentally record many facts of great interest about the island. Suetonius wrote Lives of twelve Caesars; he must write about Britain. Dio Cassius could not put together the *Historia Romana* without introducing the history of events that occurred in Britain; for a similar reason the *Annales*, the *Historiae* and the *Vita Agricolae* of Tacitus include records of our island within their wider compass. So also the writers of the *Historia Augusta*, at a later period, treat largely of Britain, as does Ammianus Marcellinus in the fourth century. The list need not be extended. Thus again, in respect of the Christians in Britain, Origen from Alexandria and Tertullian from Carthage and Athanasius wrote about their faith; Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret have notices of their Church, and similar references by writers in the three continents were made even after Britain had ceased to be Roman.

In a sense, imperial history became Church history. Before the end of the second century the Christians had made themselves a people to be reckoned with, even by those emperors and governors who were persecuting them. Emperors and Roman officials soon after A.D. 180 came to perceive that there was in their midst a new power living and working not in one city nor in one country, but almost everywhere; and one which was, in certain features, the same. Greek and Roman writers, therefore, heathen as well as Christian, when they undertook to

write of the Roman empire, wrote also of the Christian Church, and some wrote of that Church in Britain as part of the universal community which had expanded along routes opened to it by the empire itself, or even beyond the empire into localities made accessible by those routes.

The Romanizing of occupied countries preceded the Christianizing of them, and is a fact unique in the history of the past. It is found that peoples became Roman, parting, to a great extent, with their own national character, as in Gaul, and we observe in this process, as a French writer remarks, 'the singular originality of the history of Rome, giving to its action in the world an incomparable power.' 'For five centuries,' De Coulanges says, 'the patriotism of the Gauls was love of Rome.'[1] It may be that the unity arising from patriotic feeling, as we understand it, did not exist under the numerous petty chieftains of early times, with their constant quarrels, disputings, and betrayal of one another even in face of an enemy. There came another sense, and in several writers we find quoted the words of Rutilius, expressing the feeling which prevailed in the fourth century: 'Thou (Rome) hast made one country for all peoples.'[2] Sidonius Apollinaris also says of Rome: 'In this single city, comprising the whole world, only barbarians and slaves are strangers.'[3] Gildas, the British writer of the sixth century, speaks of himself and his countrymen as 'citizens (*cives*)', and of the Latin tongue as 'our language (*nostra lingua*)'.

With these thoughts in mind I have judged it proper, for the sake of some who may read this book, to set forth in outline the history of the invasion and occupation of Britain from Claudius to Constantius (A. D. 43–296). Without entering into excessive detail, we shall trace the main lines of the Romanizing process referred to, observing also its marked limitations. We may thus the better qualify

[1] Desjardins, *Géographie historique et administrative de la Gaule romaine.* De Coulanges, *La Gaule romaine*, p. 95, 'Durant cinq siècles, le patriotisme des Gaulois fut l'amour de Rome.'

[2] Rutilius Namatianus, *De Reditu suo*, i. 63. Mueller's ed.

[3] Sid. Apoll. *Epp.* i. 6.

ourselves to perceive at what time the evangelization of the province became possible and circumstances favoured it, securing so a fitting background for the proper understanding of other and later developments. One might have ended earlier than the time of Constantius; but the ten years of Carausius and Allectus have a bearing upon our subject that almost compels their inclusion. In the account here given I have tried to avoid the easy but vicious method of taking for granted any statement found ready to hand. Further, I have come to the conclusion that, instead of making references piecemeal, here or there, to the influence of Rome and the empire on Britain, or to particular events, there may be a positive gain in attempting a survey in narrative form such as has been attempted here. The general impression derived from such a process will itself aid us in forming judgements as to times and events.

Of authorities the following may be named:—

Suetonius Tranquillus in the year A.D. 120 published *De Vita Cæsarum—Lives* of twelve emperors from Divus Julius to Domitianus.

Historia Augusta: a number of biographies of certain emperors and Caesars from Hadrian to Carinus were written at the instigation of Diocletian. These at a later date, when collected together, were called *Historia Augusta*. Some of them consist of mere fiction; they show how the art of writing a biographical narrative had been lost, or as Mommsen remarks, 'wer erzählen soll, und nicht zu erzählen weiss, ins Lügen geräth,' *Hermes*, xxv, p. 229. This volume of *Hermes* has other instructive papers on the Series. See also Appendix I to Bury's Gibbon, vol. i. The most-cited Lives are those of Hadrian, Severus, and Caracalla (written about 305) by Spartianus, and others by Capitolinus and Lampridius. I have used the handy edition by Hermann Peter.

Tacitus in the *Annales* has written of events from the death of Augustus to Nero, in the *Historiae* of the time between Galba and Domitian. The *Vita Agricolae* he wrote after the death of Nerva (Sept. 96–Jan. 97).

Dio Cassius, a Greek, wrote in eighty Books the *Historia Romana*, of which XXXVI to LX are extant in full, covering the years B.C. 68–A.D. 60; the last twenty Books only in an Epitome made by Io. Xiphilinus in the eleventh century. Another 'Epitome' of Roman history was made by Zonaras about A.D. 1118, which derives significance from the fact that he transferred to his pages matter taken, apparently, verbatim from twenty-one Books of Dio Cassius; he may thus have preserved from the earlier Books of Dio Cassius the author's own words which Xiphilinus

does not give. Ranke's *Weltgeschichte*, vol. iii, contains a discussion of Zonaras's relation to Dio. Cardinal Mai's *SS. Veterum Nova Collectio*, ii. 135, contains extracts from Dio, but little, as I find, about Britain.

The PANEGYRICI are twelve laudatory Addresses delivered before various emperors; the latest of them belong to the time of Constantine. I have used Bährens's edition.

It should be noted that most of the passages bearing on Britain from these and other writers are collected together in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*.

Vol. vii of the CORPUS INSCRIPTIONUM LATINARUM contains Roman inscriptions found in Britain, edited by Hübner. It is now supplemented by an account of inscriptions discovered after the publication of vol. vii, in *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, of which Parts I-III have appeared. A comparison here and there of vol. vii with vol. viii for the province of Africa, and, particularly, with vol. xiii for Gaul, is especially instructive.

LAPIDARIUM SEPTENTRIONALE, a portly volume of all inscriptions and descriptions of remains found, as the name implies, in North Britain; published by the Society of Antiquaries, Newcastle-on-Tyne. The inscriptions and remains preserved in the Hunterian Museum of the University of Glasgow and other finds are described fully in the Catalogue, and in the *Scottish Review*.

Among modern writers the leading place belongs to Mommsen, *Röm. Geschichte*, fünfter Band (in English, *The Roman Provinces from Caesar to Diocletian*, ii, pp. 170–94). We may cite further Rhys's *Celtic Britain* and other works; also Mr. Haverfield's articles in the *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1899, *English Historical Review*, 1904, &c., *Proceedings of British Academy*, vol. ii, 1906, and his *Additamenta Quarta* in *Ephemeris Epigraphica*. Of special value also are W. Th. Watkin, *Roman Lancashire* (1883) and *Roman Cheshire* (1886); *The Handbook of the Roman Wall*, by J. C. Bruce; *Report of the Glasgow Archaeological Society* on the Wall of Antonine.

During the reign of Claudius, the often-intended annexation of Britain, now favoured apparently by internal dissensions, was begun under Aulus Plautius in A.D. 43. This commander seems to have brought over an army of between 68,000 and 70,000 men, consisting of four legions, the Legio II Augusta, Legio IX Hispana, Legio XIV Gemina Martia Victrix, and Legio XX Valeria Victrix,[1] together with their auxiliaries, and a *vexillatio* of Legio VIII Augusta. From Dio Cassius (c. 20) and the slight notice in the

[1] Dio Cassius, lx. 19–22; in c. 19 he characteristically describes the unwillingness of the troops to embark. Hübner, *Hermes*, xvi. 519, and separate issue, *Römisches Heer in Britannien*, pp. 18–29.

Agricola of Tacitus (c. 14) we gather some information respecting the Regni, who lived in the parts around Chichester and Bignor, with their chief Cogidumnus, who entered into a kind of subject alliance with the Romans; also of Caratacus, a name which survives in Caradog, and of Togodumnus his brother, sons of Cunobelinus, who was then dead. Caratacus, or Caractacus, was connected with the western part of the island, for we find him soon among the Silures in what is now South Wales, and afterwards with the Ordovices of North Wales, whence he fled to Cartismandua, queen of the Brigantes. There was a partial subjection of the Boduni, whose territory covered the present counties of Worcester, Warwick, Northampton, Buckingham, Oxford, and Berks.

Tacitus seems to regard the campaign of P. Ostorius Scapula (47–51) as the continuation of that under Aulus Plautius. There was fierce fighting against the Trinobantes, Iceni and the Silures. It was in order to expedite the operations against the Silures ('id quo promptius veniret') that he caused the *colonia* of Camulodunum (Colchester) to be founded. It was the first of the four British *coloniae*.[1] Ostorius seems to have ranged far and wide, touching upon the Brigantes (Lancashire and Yorkshire), after previously leading an army against the Cangi or Decangi, where, as Tacitus remarks, he was not far from the Irish Sea.[2]

This mention of the Irish Sea conveys an intimation as to the locality of the Ordovices, and his route there from the Cangi or Decangi, whom we may place on the borders of the present counties of Flint and Denbigh.[3]

[1] Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 31–3. Fresh supplies would come readily to Colchester.

[2] Ibid. xii. 32 'haud procul mari quod Hiberniam insulam aspectat.'

[3] DECEANGI is found on two inscribed pigs of lead, now in the Grosvenor Museum, Chester, bearing the date of Vespasian V, Titus III, as consuls, which corresponds to A. D. 74. Mr. Haverfield expands the inscription into *de Ceangi(s)* or *Deceangi(cum)*, *plumbum* being understood. There is a Tegengl in Flintshire which extended once as far as Diserth, for we read in *Brut y Tywyssogion*, p. 369: 'Ac y cadarnhaawdd Gastell y Garrec yn ymyl y Diserth yn Tegeygyl.' I am tempted to think that Ostorius crossed the Conwy on his further march, though it

Ostorius made one notable capture. Cartismandua treacherously delivered Caratacus over to the Romans; his brothers, his wife and daughter, were also made prisoners. When sent to Rome his heroic bearing and language won him his liberty and that of his family. The speech composed and put into his mouth by Tacitus suits his portrait of the man. But the sentence that has clung to our memories from our schooldays, whether actually spoken by him or fictitiously attributed to him, has been preserved by an obscure writer. This is the Epitomizer Zonaras, probably quoting Dio Cassius; looking round on the stately buildings of Rome, so Zonaras gives the story, Caradog said: 'Although you possess these and such noble buildings, you covet our poor huts.' [1]

The Silures with their marked stubbornness ('praecipua Silurum pervicacia') seem to have hastened the end of Ostorius Scapula's weary life. They were not wholly reduced by the third general, A. Didius Gallus (52–7), nor under his successor, A. Veranius, but the Twentieth Legion had advanced to Deva, and the parts previously conquered were just retained.

Under Aulus Plautius the Second Legion had reached Glevum (Gloucester), the Ninth was at Ratae (Leicester), the Fourteenth and Twentieth being at Durocornovium or Corinium, among the Dobuni, now called Cirencester; afterwards the Ninth moved forward to Lindum (Lincoln), the Fourteenth and Twentieth to Viroconium (Wroxeter) six miles from Shrewsbury, and the *Second* from Gloucester to Isca of the Silures (Caerleon on Usk); under A. Veranius the Twentieth became fixed at Deva (Chester). The two last named remained permanent camps for over three centuries, and their names are the names of the rivers near which they stood. Going back from the present name of the former, *Wysc*, we come to *Isca*, long *i* or *e* being changed into *wy*,

is not named; for a battle took place where there were steep mountains, a slow ascent, and the river had an insecure ford: 'montibus arduis . . . et praefluebat amnis vado incerto,' Tacitus, *Ann.* xii. 33. We have no 'steep hills' near any other river.

[1] Tacitus, xii. 37; Zonaras, *Annal.* xi. 10, 11. The story is given, slightly varied, among the *Excerpta* from Dio in Cardinal Mai's *Nova Collectio.*

as in *paradisus* paradwys, *candela* canwyll, *remus* rhwyf, but the town which grew around or near the camp took the name *Urbs* (or *civitas*) *legionum*, that is, in the British tongue, Caer Legeion Guar Usic, or Caer-legion, and later Caerleon, or Caerlleon ar Wysc. *Dêva* in the same way would become *Dwyv*, as the present name of the river Dyrdwy(f) shows, while here again the town is *Urbs legionum*, and, for the Britons, Caer-legion, Caerlleon. The British *kair* or *caer* has no connexion with *castra*.

The advance so far may be roughly outlined by the Severn and Dee on the west, and perhaps the Humber on the north. Those stubborn folk, the Brigantes, among whom Cartismandua and her unhappy husband Venutius figure, had scarcely been touched; the people of both North and South Wales remained only partially subdued, ready at any moment for insurrection.

Q. Suetonius Paulinus was Legate of Britain from A.D. 59 to 61, under Nero. Two expressions used by Tacitus in the *Vita Agricolae* are significant of the difficulties the Romans met with in their attempt to control a people fiercely hostile to them. He relates, in describing the years when Agricola was serving under Suetonius, that 'at no time was Britain more disturbed and held in greater uncertainty'; again, mentioning the sudden recall of Suetonius from Mona, he assigns as cause 'the revolt of all Britain'.[1] There were two years of continuous fighting, though we are not informed of the districts covered by these struggles. Suetonius's move to Mona may be regarded as part of his attempt to reduce the Ordovices, though other reasons connected with the influence of religion may have co-operated. Mona was reputed to be a chief centre of Druidic teaching and inspiration, but the only reason for the advance of Suetonius assigned by Tacitus is that the island afforded an asylum for fugitives and a source of fresh supplies for insurgents.[2]

To reduce Mona, Suetonius exposed his rear, and though

[1] *Vita Agric.* 5 and 18.

[2] *Ann.* xiv. 29 'receptaculum perfugarum.' *Vita Agric.* 14 'Monam insulam, ut vires rebellibus ministrantem.'

the little island fell, all Britain rose in revolt. The familiar story of Boudica, or Buddug, as the Britons called her, need not be told here, nor that of the fury of insurrection which spread among the Iceni and Trinobantes and other peoples. Suetonius, after fearful encounters, in which the Ninth Legion, led by Cerealis, suffered most, was at last victorious with the Fourteenth and the auxiliaries that came to his aid. The Ninth came from Lincoln, the *vexillarii* and other auxiliary forces were furnished by Deva (Chester), while the Praefectus of the camp at Isca refused the aid of the Second Augusta. He was accused of jealousy; he may have had his fears of the Silures; soon after, in any case, he committed suicide. The broken Ninth received again its complement of men from Germany—legionaries, auxiliaries, and cavalry. Suetonius was recalled before ending the war. Petronius Turpilianus, his successor, secured peace of a kind, but attempted no new advances.[1]

Trebellius Maximus (63–9) saw a period of 'continued warfare which taught the troops', as Tacitus remarks, 'to fix their hatred upon the enemy.' The empire was then distracted by disastrous civil wars, which ended in the proclamation of Vespasian as emperor, July, A. D. 69. Meanwhile the Fourteenth Legion had been recalled by Nero, but was again sent back to Britain under Vettius Bolanus in 69, and finally recalled in the following year. Its place was taken by a newly formed legion, the *Legio II Adiutrix Pia Fidelis*, of which we have traces at Lincoln and Chester, whence it was recalled about 88.[2]

Vespasian sent Cerealis to Britain, a Legate who had proved victorious against the Batavians. He at once attacked the Brigantes,[3] advancing from the *colonia* of Camulodunum (Colchester), and seems to have subdued a great part of the country as far as the Wash. The Ninth Legion may have moved northward to Eburacum (York), which the Britons

[1] Tacitus, *Vita Agric.* 16; *Ann.* xiv. 39.

[2] Tacitus, *Hist.* ii. 65, 66; Hübner, *Corpus Inscr. Lat.* vii, pp. 52, 53; Haverfield, *Catalogue of Grosvenor Museum, Chester*, Preface and Nos. 23–35.

[3] Tacitus, *Vita Agric.* 17.

of a later date called Cair Ebrauc, then Caer Evrawc.[1] The Ordovices as a whole remained unreduced; the Silures of South Wales, that 'strong and warlike people' (*validu et pugnax Silurum gens*), as Tacitus describes them, were overcome by the next Legate, Sex. Julius Frontinus (74–8).

We observe that important advances were made by these Legati of the Flavian house; Vespasian again sent a man of great capacity, who is the best known to us because a master writer, Tacitus his own son-in-law, has left an imperishable picture of him and, to some extent, of Britain also. In reading the *Life of Agricola* afresh, I have experienced the feeling which results from the perusal of many Lives of Saints; there is the same spirit of lofty encomium expressed in generalities, though with finer power, and the same paucity of distinctive names of localities or peoples, with a similar absence of other details. Consequently, though the *Vita* is a great book, the conviction remains that it adds less than might be expected to our knowledge of Britain. A few names of places we find, but only on the extreme borders, while, for instance, Eburacum and the Brigantes are not noticed. We start with the reduction of Mona and the Ordovices, then, up to the third year, no place-names occur. New peoples (*novae gentes*), but unnamed, are afterwards attacked near an estuary to which the name Taus, or, by another reading, Tanaus, is given. This name has been explained with some probability as denoting the Firth of Tay, identical with Ptolemy's *Δαούα*, though others, with less probability, understand it as meaning Tyne. In the fourth year Agricola must have passed without opposition between Solway and Tyne, where Hadrian's Wall was afterwards built, since he finds his enemies on the neck of land between Clota and Bodotria, that is between Clyde and Forth.[2] It seems impossible to understand the words of Tacitus as implying that a wall, or, as Gibbon says, 'a line of military stations,' was formed here by Agricola, after-

[1] Ebrauc in Nennius, p. 210, Evrawc in the Welsh version of Geoffrey of Monmouth—the Brut.

[2] *Vita Agric.* 22, 23.

wards to be unified and fortified by the turf Wall of Antoninus. This view was first set forth by Horsley in the *Britannia Romana*; it has been followed by many British writers, 'nisi fallor, omnes,' says Hübner. What we read is *praesidiis firmabatur*, no more, the very phrase used also of parts in the middle of Britain (c. 20), which can only mean that he availed himself of entrenched positions, not necessarily in any line. By means of the fleet he was, in his fifth year, able to advance further north. He observed how near Ireland lay and the advantage that might accrue to the empire by the subjugation of it, a plan which needed, as Agricola thought, only one legion with its auxiliaries to accomplish.

After retreating within Bodotria, again, with the assistance of the fleet Agricola attacked inner Caledonia, success following success. There was great slaughter, after which the victorious general retreated to a place in the territory of the Boresti,[1] a name not yet identified any more than *mons Graupius*, which is probably no part of the Grampians. We observe that such local names as Maeatae, Caledonii and Picti do not appear in the narrative; all are simply *Britanni*.[2]

Agricola was, however, unable to maintain his position in these northern parts, gained though they were at great cost and heavy losses; he was recalled because there was impatience at Rome on account of the excessive strain. Some modern historians, Schiller for instance,[3] are inclined to justify his recall. A few points should be particularly noticed here. Of the seven years spent by Agricola in Britain, the last four were occupied in the northern ex-

[1] Prof. Rhys (*Scottish Review*, 1891) says, 'in later times the word Verturiones yielded in Goedelic the well-known name of the Brythons of the kingdom of *Fortrenn*; they were possibly the people previously called Boresti'—though he allows that this is by no means certain.

[2] It ought to be added that *Caledonia* is found in the *Vita Agric.* c. 10. Dio Cassius speaks of the 'Caledonii' for 197 (lxxv. 5), and, for 208, of the 'Caledonii and Maeatae' as 'the two greatest nations of the Brittani' (lxxvi. 12). The name is preserved in Old Welsh: Cat Coit Celidon, the battle at the Wood of Celidon. Nennius, c. 56.

Two inscriptions, one from Ilkley, the other from Bowes, give the name of Virius Lupus, *C. I. L.* 210, 273.

[3] *Geschichte der röm. Kaiserzeit*, i. 527.

peditions, the first in subduing Mona and North Wales, the other two (80–1) saw frequent warfare and building of fortified places (*Vita Agric.* 10–17). Now under these circumstances it is difficult to accept the generally received idea that other work was accomplished by Agricola in Britain which would crown all else. This work, which Tacitus represents as the instruction of the sons of British chiefs in arts and the use of the Latin tongue, and the introduction of Roman fashions of dress and Roman styles of architecture—all this must have been meagre in opportunity and effect. The civilizing of a country by one engaged in conquering it would seem an especially befitting theme for a monograph of praise, though it would not be historically likely, when the conqueror was so busy. We are led to infer, from reading the whole of these nine chapters, that an exaggerated estimate has been formed of what Agricola did in this direction.

Immediately on his departure insurrection again became rife. It is now that we feel the immense loss of such a writer as Tacitus, as we endeavour to catch glimpses of Britain after the time of Agricola. Dio Cassius recounts the circumnavigation of Britain by the fleet of Agricola, but then becomes silent respecting our island until, in narrating the history of the Jewish war, he has occasion to tell that Julius Severus was recalled from Britain for service in Palestine (A.D. 134). An inscription which Hübner dates A.D. 108–9 proves that the Ninth Legion was then at York;[1] to this bare piece of evidence we add the information conveyed in the beginning of Spartian's *Vita Hadriani* that 'the Britons could not be held in submission to Rome'. Nothing further is told or known; this fact is simply mentioned among the several untoward events of the last days of Trajan (*c.* A.D. 115–17), which led his successor Hadrian to adopt a new policy. In accordance with the new policy the boundaries of the empire were in places narrowed, and the frontiers strengthened. About this time, between 115 and 122, the Ninth Legion appears to have been annihilated or

[1] *C. I. L.* vii, pp. 64, 241, Nos. 231–59.

absorbed; its name disappears, and the Sixth Valeria Victrix takes its place, being brought over from Germany.[1]

The following table will remind us of the three stations at which the legions remained up to the fifth century:—

Eboracum, i.e. York	Legio VI Valeria Victrix.
Isca Silurum, i.e. Caerleon on Usk	Legio II Augusta.
Deva, i.e. Caerlleon, or Chester	Legio XX Valeria Victrix.

A legion, though its head-quarters remained the same, was continually recruited from any or all parts of the continent of Europe, but not from among the Britons themselves; at least, no British contingents served here. The insurrection still continuing, Hadrian himself, after visiting Germania and Batavia, crossed over to Britain. This was in 122, and in the winter of the same year he returned to Gaul. It was about this time that the great wall was constructed, stretching from Bowness on the Solway to Wallsend on the Tyne. If we take the words of Spartian to guide us, its object was to separate *barbari* from *Romani*.[2] The implication is that the *Vallum Hadriani*, as it is called, was a part of that boundary line—*limes imperii*—which was constructed also for the eastern limits of the empire from the Rhine to the Danube.

Dio Cassius, though he does not mention the building of the wall, speaks of it in his account of Septimius Severus as a well-known structure, yet simply as 'the wall which divides some of the peoples from the Roman camps', or again as 'the separating wall which cuts the island in two'.[3] The work on this wall was carried on by detachments from the Sixth Legion at York, from the Second at Caerleon and the Twentieth at Chester, also by a host of auxiliaries, with the aid of companies from the Seventh (Spain), the Eighth and Twenty-Second (Mainz).[4]

[1] *C. I. L.* vii, pp. 5, 61, Nos. 231–59.

[2] *Vita Hadriani*, c. 11. 2 'murumque per octaginta millia passuum duxit, qui barbaros Romanosque diuideret.' The next chapter (12) employs *diuidere* in the same sense: 'locis, in quibus barbari non fluminibus sed limitibus diuiduntur.'

[3] Dio Cass. lxxii. 8, and lxxvi. 12.

[4] *C. I. L.* vii, pp. 106–64, and other inscriptions discovered later.

When we take up such a work as the *Notitia Dignitatum*,[1] a kind of Official Directory and Army List for the whole Roman empire, we are struck by the evidence it affords of the troops serving along the wall; there were 16 Tribunes of Cohorts, and 6 Praefecti of Cavalry, distributed over 23 camps or stations, and covering about 73 miles of length. Such a garrison, it has been computed, would number about 15,000 men, while the Sixth Legion at York would be within call. The construction of the wall itself must impress any one who has walked along it in different places as being far more than a boundary, and as having primarily a military purpose, with enemies to guard against on both sides, Britons on the south no less than Caledonians on the north. The *stationes*, or camps, are military; the numerous towers and 'mile-castles' presuppose a strong garrison. Mommsen regards the road on the level part running between wall and earthen vallum as the *limes* (boundary) proper; it is somewhat differently held by others that while the wall is a military construction, the vallum is a line of frontier simply.[2] 'The whole of the works proceed from one side of the island to the other in a nearly direct line, and in comparatively close companionship. The stone wall and earthen rampart are generally within sixty or eighty yards of each other. The distance between them, however, varies according to the nature of the country.' 'The vallum, or earth wall, is uniformly to the south of the stone wall. It consists of three ramparts and a fosse.'[3]

In work of this character we see the influence of Hadrian's policy, which aimed at safeguarding the frontiers and inward consolidation of the empire in all parts. There is plentiful evidence in the remains which meet the eye to-day that there must have been, besides the soldiery, a host of skilled workmen along this line from Carlisle to

[1] Böcking's edition, p. 113, *Item per lineam valli*. Dr. Böcking's edition was published at Bonn, 1839–53. The *Notes* are of special value. A new and better *Text* has been edited by Seeck, but without Notes, Berlin, 1876. See Dr. Hodgkin's *Italy and Her Invaders*, vol. i, pp. 595–7.

[2] See Haverfield on Roman Britain in *Edinburgh Review*, April, 1899.

[3] Bruce, *Handbook to the Roman Wall*, pp. 16, 21; Hübner, *Hermes*, xvi. 583.

Newcastle; the masonry so solidly worked in towers, arches, bridges, villas, required the aid of such craftsmen; then, for these as well as for the military, would follow active trading which would bring Briton and foreigner alike into close contact with the army and the new class of civilians. Under Antoninus Pius the effects of the extensive activity of Hadrian towards consolidating the empire within closer boundaries are clearly discernible. Yet in Britain a revolt of the Brigantes, aided, probably, by incursions from the north, led to a temporary extension of boundary. The Legate, Q. Lollius Urbicus, was able to quell the rising among the Brigantes soon after A.D. 140, and then to carry his army northwards.[1] In 142 he built the 'turf wall' (*murus cespiticius*), as it is called by Capitolinus, from Clyde to Forth. Inscriptions show that Lollius Urbicus had for the building of this wall, and undoubtedly for the conduct of the war, detachments from the Second Legion (Isca), the Twentieth (Chester), as well as from the Sixth (York);[2] other forces were evidently transferred from the Wall of Hadrian for the same purposes.[3]

Gildas mentions the building of the two walls, and although he is evidently in error as to the time of construction, he nevertheless writes as one who was familiar with them, and had often seen them. His own date for the construction of the walls might be placed between the defeat followed by the death of Maximus and the revolt of Constantine, that is, between 389 and 407; he also, mistakenly, makes the turf wall the earlier; yet he correctly describes it as 'factus non tam lapidibus quam cespitibus'; stone *was* used as a foundation, as is evident on the spot to-day. The other wall (Hadrian's), he adds, 'was built in the accustomed mode of structure, in a straight line from sea to sea.'[4]

[1] Capitolinus, of the *Historia Augusta*, in his *Vita Pii*, c. 5; Pausanias, viii. 43. 4. Coins seem to fix the insurrection and its suppression to the years A. D. 140–5; Hübner, *Corpus Inscr. Lat.* vii, pp. 191–3.

[2] The fullest account of this turf wall, construction, recent surveys and investigations, will be found in the *Report of the Glasgow Archaeological Society*, and *The Scottish Archaeological Review*.

[3] Hübner, *C. I. L.* vii, p. 192.

[4] Gildas, *De Excidio Brit.* cc. 15, 18. Beda has followed Gildas in these errors.

There were thus, in the Walls of Hadrian and Antoninus, two boundary ramparts, both built for defensive and offensive operations, so that the somewhat long period of comparative peace may be due to the more imposing strength gained by the double chain.

The *Vita* of Marcus Aurelius by Capitolinus speaks of a British war, and of Sex. Calpurnius Agricola as sent over to quell it. Two inscriptions, one at Ribchester, not far from the camp at Coccium (Wigan), the other at Housesteads, near the Wall of Hadrian, supply his name and indicate his route. This may have been about A.D. 162.[1] Under Marcus's son and successor, Commodus, in 184, we find the peoples on the north side of the higher wall becoming restive; they broke through, and killed the Roman commander, but were soon overcome.[2]

Insurrectionary troubles in Britain were intermittent only, nor were they serious; movements far more violently disturbing came to pass in the fourth century when the island was nominally Christian. As far as can be seen, the second half of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, and still more the years of his son, Commodus, might be regarded as a time when, so far as concerns the outward state of the island, Christianity might be penetrating among Romans and Britons.

It has been observed that, in numerous parts of the empire, a strong Romanizing of the provinces took place in the time of Hadrian; about that time, distant places westwards particularly shared in the development of local administration and municipal life of the Roman type, and we are certainly led to conclude that what is attributed generally to Agricola, owing to the generous and exquisitely written eulogies of his son-in-law in the *Vita Agricolae*, ought really to be placed to the credit of the widely applied policy introduced by Hadrian. This tendency continued until the time of Severus (193–211). It also synchronized with a significant change in the position of the Christian Church in

[1] *Historia Augusta*, Hübner, and *C. I. L.* vii, pp. 225, 758, 774, 775.

[2] Dio Cassius, lxxii. 8. Commodus took the title Britannicus in 184, as the coinage shows, but as Aelius Lampridius says, *Vita Comm. Aut.* 8 'ab adulatoribus.'

the public life of the empire. The subject will require a more detailed consideration, for which the present is not the place.

Britain, during the struggles which followed the death of Commodus in 193, found itself, along with Gaul and Spain, under the rule of Clodius Septimius Albinus. Albinus, supported by the army in Britain and elsewhere, laid claim to the purple, and Severus, who meanwhile had been proclaimed emperor by the Roman Senate, for a time acknowledged his claim. From the account of Dio Cassius it may be gathered that the British Pretender, yielding to the crafty cajoling of Severus, must have found the island a quiet quarter in which to enjoy his new dignity, 'glad,' as Herodianus also says, 'to acquire what he desired without battle and without danger.' When, however, Severus had overcome Niger, the other Pretender, about the end of 194, he turned westwards against Albinus. With British and Gallic forces Albinus at length met him near Lyon, and fell vanquished after a bloody battle on February 19, 197.[1] Severus became sole undisputed ruler.

During these conflicts Britain had its share of suffering, inasmuch as the depletion of troops that took place when Albinus crossed over to Gaul tempted two northern tribes, the Maeatae and Caledonii, to make an attack on the Roman part of the island, south of the two walls. These names appear in 197 for the first time in connexion with these inroads, perhaps before Severus had conquered Albinus in Gaul; for Tacitus, those tribes whom Agricola, as he narrates, had 'driven into a second island', are always *Britanni*; now they are 'barbarians' who, from time to time, ravage 'civilized' Britain when the Roman troops stationed there become thinned, or are otherwise unable to cope with them. Virius Lupus the legate, hard pressed, was driven to the expedient of 'buying peace for a large sum of money from the Maeatae'.

We have no information of troubles in other parts of the island; the war in Britain was, nevertheless, regarded as grave, since the *legatus*—not Virius Lupus, but more probably L. Alfenius Senecio—sent urgent messages either

[1] Dio Cassius, lxxiii. 14, 15; lxv. 5, 6; Herodianus, iii. 8 and 16.

for a larger force or for the presence of the emperor himself. This was about 205, probably later.[1] It will be right to remember, with no small insistence upon the fact, that from the time Albinus crossed over to Gaul in 197 until shortly before the death of Severus, which took place in 211, Britain must have appeared to many an unconquered land, though it was not so in reality. For twelve or thirteen years there were barbarian depredations, with conflicts successful and unsuccessful, including a loss to the Romans, according to Dio Cassius, of 50,000 men in the forward marches of Severus alone.[2]

On this account the single clause of detail added by Tertullian in his 'rhetorical' list of places in the *Adversus Iudaeos* has real and significant meaning when applied, as it is by him, to Britain alone, and must be taken as implying a very widespread impression: 'places among the Britons,' so he writes, 'which the Romans cannot reach' ('Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca').[3] Things were at their worst in Britain then, and 'rhetoric' does not always fling away fact. We are struck by the imperfect means of transit existing in Britain; Severus is described as under the necessity of clearing forests, cutting hills, making roads through marshes, and spanning rivers with bridges;[4] yet his conquests over the Caledonians and their sympathizers among the Britons, though tardy, were at last complete. Overcome by hardships and harassed by family troubles, this emperor died at York, February 4, 211.

Septimus Severus divided the hitherto single province of Britannia into two, of which the northern, having Eboracum as its centre, was called *Britannia Inferior*; the southern, below a line from the Mersey to the Humber, including the parts protected by the garrisons of Deva and Isca, had the name *Britannia Superior*. It is stated, though the evi-

[1] *C. I. L.* vii. No. 513 connects Senecio's name, as Hübner believes, with those of Severus and Caracalla, No. 1013 with Geta's also; it is concluded that he was legate from 205 to 208. Cf. Nos. 269, 270.

[2] Dio Cassius, lxxvi. 13.

[3] *Adv. Iud.* 7. The implication of these words and their date will be discussed later.

[4] Dio Cassius, and Herodian, iii. 14.

dence is scanty, that after the fall of Allectus, when the island was reconquered by Constantius, four provinces were formed, to which the following names are given: Britannia Prima, Britannia Secunda, Flavia Caesariensis, Britannia Maxima. Following the peace established by Theodosius the elder, i. e. after 369, a fifth province was added, and named Valentia, but its boundaries are unknown.

Neither in Dio Cassius nor in Herodianus is there any intimation that a wall was built by Severus from sea to sea. The former expressly mentions the wall through which the Maeatae and Caledonii broke in, and this can only be the Wall of Hadrian, existing since about 122. On the other hand Aelius Spartianus, that one of the Scriptores of the *Historia Augusta* who wrote (in 305) the Life of Severus, has a very brief paragraph in which he narrates that Severus 'fortified Britain, the greatest jewel of his empire, by building a wall to the sea on both sides'.[1] Other writers, such as Eutropius, Aurelius Victor and the Epitome, Orosius, and Cassiodorus, follow,[2] all in turn repeating some original error. No wall, we can well believe, was built by Severus, though he naturally strengthened and restored many parts of the existing one. Henceforth this Wall of Hadrian, repaired by Severus, remained as the northern limit of the empire. Severus' two unworthy sons, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (Caracalla) and Septimus Geta, who were with him in Britain, succeeded him, but the younger soon fell a victim to the ambitious hatred of the elder. Of them, as well as of their mother, Julia Domna, there are not a few memorial inscriptions, indicating, it would seem, a period of flourishing active life in Britain, however turbulent elsewhere.

About this time we begin to notice in Britain dedications on altars and temples to those oriental deities such as Isis and Mithra, whose cult obtained a wide diffusion and became such an agent of fermentation in the heathenism of the empire. As the god of the poor and afflicted, the god of earnest souls, desirous of moral discipline, Mithra drew

[1] *Vita Severi*, 18; in c. 22 he seems to think of Hadrian's Wall.

[2] Eutr. viii. 18, 19; Aur. Vict. 20; Or. vii. 17; Cass. *ad ann.* 207.

after him disciples in many parts, chiefly among the troops. We are ignorant whether any impression was made by the strange mysteries of this religion on the native Britons. The army in their midst, recruited from so many countries, Gaul, Germany, Spain, Italy, Pannonia, &c., made this cult part of their life.[1] At Caerleon, at Chester, and by the Roman Wall in the north, evidences of Mithraic worship are found. Few of these afford dates, but the next reigns begin to furnish some. The dedicatory stone DEO INVICTO SOLI SOCIO, wherein Mithra as usual is the 'Invincible Sun-god and Comrade', which belongs to the time of Elagabalus, about A. D. 219–22. The oriental character of this strange prince thus made an impression in Britain, since the dedication recorded in this inscription is made for his well-being (*pro salute*). Others have been found, but need not be noticed here. The fact that a Persian religion was finding votaries in Britain, and finding them by those methods of propagation which M. Cumont describes in detail—chiefly trade and the recruiting of auxiliary troops —is significant. We observe that heathen soldiers could spread this cult openly, as it did not exclude worship of other gods, while the Christian soldier, restrained by his deepest convictions, was debarred. He could use the same means, but was obliged to spread his faith secretly; on the other hand, Roman military officers, as well as the emperors themselves, favoured the new rites and the building of altars and temples in honour of Mithra; these two facts should be clearly borne in mind in the conceptions we form of these times.

We have now traced the consolidation of the Roman occupation up to the time when Severus died at York. Many inscriptions of this early date survive and have received most thorough elucidation in vol. vii of Hübner's *Corpus*, by Mr. Haverfield in the *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, and by several others. Yet in these memorials of the past we see no mention whatever of Christianity, nor shall we find any in those of a later date until we arrive at the beginning of

[1] Cumont, Inscr. 471–90, *Textes et Monuments figurés relatifs aux Mystères de Mithra*. *C. I. L.* vii, Nos. 1039, 833, 542.

the fifth century. In the rich museum collected at Great Chesters, near Chollerford on the Tyne, I could not help asking myself the question whether an inscription I saw on quite a number of small altars there might not darkly indicate a heathen sense of intrusion on the part of some new religion, such as Christianity. These altars bore the inscription *To the old gods—Dis veteribus*, and might imply deprecation of the worship of the 'new god' of the Christians. The words, nevertheless, are capable of another interpretation.

The mere absence of Christian inscriptions is in no way surprising; the vast majority of these records are simply military or civic (official records, such as might be read to-day anywhere in Britain in a cemetery); and Christians may have inscribed on their graves familiar words used of old for such memorials. Further, it should be remembered that Christian inscriptions proper nowhere occur very early. At Rome there are not more than fourteen dated ones that go back to A. D. 279 (De Rossi, *Inscr. Chr. Urbis Romae*, i. 1–14); M. Edm. le Blant, in his *Inscriptions Chrétiennes de la Gaule*, reckons four from the middle of the fourth century, fifty-four of the fifth century (tome iii, Second Preface; cf. tome i, p. 119); the oldest dated Christian inscription of North Africa, found at Tipara in Mauretania, goes back to A. D. 238.[1] These are places of which the Christian history is well known as being of a far earlier time than the inscriptions, few though they be.

Christians were obliged to be cautious and circumspect amid the trying circumstances of the early centuries; churches, cemeteries, and catacombs must have been sacked and destroyed in numberless places. There were many men who passed as heathen and were not, while some inscriptions were Christian in spite of D. M. S., as others were professedly Christian though retaining this Dis Manibus Sacrum, of which M. le Blant gives examples in Gaul. Mr. Haverfield is inclined to doubt whether an inscription found at Tommen y Mur near Trawsfynydd can be Christian, though of late date, because it has the letters D M and because no known Christian inscription in Britain gives the lettering.[2] Our knowledge respecting Britain in the

[1] *C. I. L.* vol. viii, n. 870.

[2] *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, fasc. tertius, n. 854, p. 284.

early years of the sixth century, derived from other sources, points to a different conclusion.

Something of greater meaning comes into prominence in the glimpses we have had of Britain in process of being Romanized. The long peace, though a few times broken, was beginning. As a Roman province, and, in respect of official honours, a province of some consequence, and related to the world-life of the empire, Britain was being prepared to be a fitter and more favourable place for the propagation of the religion of Jesus Christ. We cannot forget how early and how thoroughly the Christian faith and Christian institutions had spread in such places as Coptic Egypt, which imperial civilization had scarcely touched. There must have been favouring circumstances for the introduction and the propagation of the new religion in the city life, the trade, and the education that grew up around as well as within different districts, as Roman power became fixed. The Roman private house, here as elsewhere, would furnish sufficient space for worship, and for all the simple rites which a Church required at the time when Christian communities could be formed in Britain.

We come now to an unwelcome gap in the history of the Roman occupation of Britain. So far as any hint or suggestion from historians or chroniclers might help us, the whole time from the death of Severus at York (211) to the beginning of the reign of Diocletian (284) is almost a blank. Except for a brief allusion made by Flavius Vopiscus (one of the writers of the *Historia Augusta*) to Florianus (276) and Probus (276–82), showing that Britain, along with Spain and Gaul, amid the turmoil of those years acknowledged the former as emperor for a term counted only by days, and the latter for half a dozen years, this period of more than seventy years of British history is unknown to us.[1]

In Mommsen's list (*Chronica Minora*, iii. 4) there are twenty-seven emperors between Severus and Diocletian (211–84), of whom about twenty died violent deaths, six

[1] Flavius Vopiscus, *Probus*, 18. 4. There is just the mention of Britanni in *Carinus*, 16. 2. Zosimus also makes a slight allusion to Probus, *Historia Nova*, i. 66.

perishing in the course of a few months during 217–18. Rival generals in different parts of the empire were proclaimed emperors by their legions, and the disorder reached its climax during the time of Gallienus (260–8). It was then that the so-called Gallo-Roman empire, or, as we may also call it, Gallo-Britannic, was founded; the barbarian German tribes were finding opportunities, owing to the general confusion of events, and the paralysis of the central authority, to cross the Rhine, committing terrible ravages over the provinces of Gaul. The Gallic legionaries, with whom the civic population had common interests in the public safety, undertook to repel these depredators. They were led by M. Cassianus Latinius Postumus, Governor of Gaul, who, after certain sanguinary acts, was proclaimed emperor in 259. His empire was a separate empire, but was acknowledged in Britain and Spain, and lasted for nearly fourteen years. Postumus died, as was then usual, a violent death in 268, after which date there were Laelianus and Marius for a few months, then Victorinus and Tetricus, as emperors, until Aurelian in 272 brought back the three separated countries under his own rule. We cannot but dwell with some insistence on this fact, that Britain for fourteen years had thrown in its lot with a separate western empire and had thereby shared in the safeguarded prosperity and toleration which that time fostered. In a later chapter reasons will be adduced for placing the martyrdom of St. Alban earlier than the Gallo-Roman empire, which began in 259, during either the Decian or the Valerian persecution. After a while there was to come a further ten years of separate existence with, to all appearance, similar prosperity.

Such names as Severus Alexander (222–35), Maximinus (235–8), Philip the Arabian (244–9), Decius (249–51), Valerian (253–60), Gallienus (sole emperor 260–8), are so well known, especially in their relation to Christianity and the Christian Church, that it is sorely disappointing to observe that Britain found no writer during their time to record its story. After these emperors it can be but natural for us to reason that, as the Gallo-Roman empire did not consider itself a rival but a part of the Roman empire, the

policy of Gallienus, indicated in his Edict of Toleration (260), was readily observed in Gaul and Britain also.

There are fragments of information preserved in many an inscription, which, after what has been said, may give us glimpses of our country with a meaning beyond the mere interest of the inscription itself. For instance, we have in Britain no inscription which bears the name of Gallienus except in conjunction with the name of Valerian. The tablet found at Caerleon records that the 'Emperors Valerianus and Gallienus Augusti, and Valerianus Caesar (son of Gallienus), restored buildings for certain centuries of the Seventh Cohort, through the Legate *pro praetore* Desticius Juba, and Vitulasius Laetinianus, Legate of the Second Legion (Augusta), under the supervision of Domitius Potentinus, Prefect of the same Legion '.[1] This son of Gallienus died in 259, so that the stone was put up before that date, but after 253.

Three of the Gallo-Roman emperors named above, though classed as *tyranni* in Mommsen's list (*Chronica Minora*, iii. 4, p. 481), have their names inscribed on milestones discovered in South Wales—Postumus on two stones found near the top of Trecastlehill in the vicinity of Brecon,[2] Victorinus on a stone discovered near Neath and preserved in the Museum at Swansea,[3] and Tetricus on two stones from Bittern near Southampton.[4] Of three altars found at Amboglana (Birdoswald), two bear the name of a cohort named after Postumus, and one the title of the same cohort named after Tetricus. Nevertheless Britain was so far severed from the central power at Rome that we fail to find the name of Claudius Gothicus (268–70), the successor of Gallienus. The name of Aurelian, who subdued this separate Gallo-Britannic empire, is found once on a milestone, as also that of Florianus (276) and of Numerianus (283–4); four at least of the emperors who reigned between Aurelian (275) and Diocletian (284) have left no record on any British inscription. Britain evidently held aloof.

It may be concluded with confidence that in Britain, as in other parts of the West—Gaul, Spain, and Africa—Roman

[1] *C. I. L.* vii. 107.
[2] ibid. 1161, 1162.
[3] ibid. 1160, 1150, 1151.
[4] ibid. 820, 822, 823.

civilization had so far progressed as to cause the provinces to feel themselves equal, if not, at times, superior, to Italy. The lively consciousness of the difference between 'Roman' and 'barbarian' which marks British feeling even in the pages of Gildas as late as the sixth century, tended to intensify the severed life to which our attention has been drawn. It may even have continued as a dissociating tendency until the time of Constantine. His conversion, though far from creating, revealed and strengthened another bond that had been wonderfully penetrating the more western nations at least since the middle of the third century. The reunited empire found itself more strongly knit by the developed institutions of the Christian Church.

Some interesting pieces of information as to the earlier years after the death of Severus may be culled from the British inscriptions. I mention a few. In the neighbourhood of Chollerton (Cilurnum) on the South Tyne, near the Roman Wall and camp, a temple had fallen down through age; this temple was rebuilt by the Second cavalry regiment of Asturians and dedicated on October 30, A.D. 221.[1] In the following year a public building of some kind—a riding school—termed a *basilica equestris exercitatoria*, was erected by another Spanish cohort in honour of Severus Alexander.[2]

At Housesteads (Borcovicus), again on the Wall of Hadrian, a Mithraic grotto has been discovered, with six altars in it; one of these bears the names of the Emperors Gallus and Volusianus as consuls, and here we find proof that the worship of Mithra was common among the soldiers in the year 252.[3] Caerleon on Usk (where the Second Legion was stationed) before A.D. 270, probably, saw a temple to Diana raised by a man of distinction named Postumius Varus. His rank may be gathered from the fact that he was City Prefect of Rome in 271, but at the time he built this temple he was, as the inscription indicates, *legatus*, or general, of the Second Legion. This temple was erected during the period of the Gallo-Britannic empire. A Christian Church in Britain, as facts of this kind remind us, might have to look upon all such heathenism as an active hostile force.

[1] *C. I. L.* vii. 585. [2] ibid. 965. [3] ibid. 646.

Britain during this period therefore had been formed into a regular constituent part of the empire, over which there presided a governor called *legatus pro praetore*, always of consular rank. Instead of the old methods of administration by the unwritten rules or laws of the Druids and the almost absolute power of the kings, an ideal and practice of the administration of civil affairs by process of law had arisen: the people were citizens, *cives*, and courts and councils became familiar to them. We find remains of magazines or granaries, aqueducts, roads, and bridges in different places. Several milestones have survived from the time of Hadrian; many of them bear names of emperors between Severus and Constantine of whose relation to Britain, as has been said, history is silent. Proof is here furnished that the provincial life of the island was proceeding even at times when no writings survive to attest it.[1] There must also have been, in the somewhat limited form of separateness prevailing under these men, a temper which could not fail to be favourable to the Christians.

Excavations made of late years in different places give us intimations of Roman life in Britain. At Chollerton or Great Chesters, near the Roman Wall, we see even now the outline of the buildings in a Roman camp, the streets showing the clear effect of the wear and tear due to constant walking over the stones, and marks of wheels in ruts, and spacious sewers. Close by, there stand to-day the lower portions of the grand Roman house, showing the mode of luxuriously heating its inner rooms by hypocausts. Borcovicus tells the same story, where, along with the camp arrangements of buildings, the vividness is heightened by the sight of traces of feet, and even of frequent sitting on stones during hours of leisure.

But, besides the camps and garrison towns, there are revealed to us remains of *civitates* large and small, with industrious, even wealthy, populations, in which the basement rooms of certain houses can be traced. Such British *oppida*, grown to prosperous Roman-British towns, were Viroconium (Wroxeter), Corlingham, Thorpe, Cirencester and Bignor. Two of this kind have, of late years, been the

[1] *Archaeol. Cambr.* 2, 1847.

objects of special investigation. Caerwent in Monmouthshire, by excavations that have been in progress since 1899, has been proved to be a country town of this description, and probably the tribal centre of the Silures, which kept on its life at least until the fifth century. Silchester has opened out the buried secrets of its past Roman character as a city that was occupied and inhabited far down into the fifth century. It stood, under the British name Calleva, in a corner of what is now North Hampshire, at a junction of important roads; it had been the capital of the Atrebates, as several coins attest,[1] and retained in its name—Calleva Atrebatum—both a reminiscence of this fact and a witness of the persistence of old British boundaries until the obliteration caused by the Saxon invasion. Its plan of an irregular octagon has been made out, in which it corresponded to Viroconium, Verulamium and Anderida (Pevensey), while several other towns were rectangular; coins have been found there bearing dates from Caligula (37–41) to Arcadius (394–408), a fact that betokens a long and late period of existence as compared with other places, where the coins found, though numerous, do not extend beyond the time of Commodus.

These towns, and perhaps the very camps, would provide convenient starting-places for the Christians and their work of propagation; there would be opposition, no doubt, and probably persecution, by popular outcry and tumultuary methods, or through the personal predilection of *legatus* and *praeses*; but for this the Christians would be prepared. '*Castra ipsa* filled by Christians,' are the words of Tertullian in the *Apologeticus*, and they became, as time advanced, old camps surrounded by the gains of civilization in the towns which had their industries, trade, arts, architecture. All these supplied the obscure Christian's opportunities. They were birthplaces of Britain's Christianity.

The empire began a new life when C. Aurelius Valerius Diocletianus was proclaimed emperor on the 17th of Sep-

[1] Evans, *British Coins*. He agrees with Hübner's map in *C.I.L.* that there were not two towns of this name, but one. Excavations are being carried on at Corbridge (Corstopitum), Cattleshaw, Gelligaer, and other places.

tember, 284, the effects of which were to be felt in Britain. From this event, with the fixity of affairs it brought, we shall come to Constantius, to Helena, and to Constantine. After a short sojourn at Rome, and afterwards in Moesia and Pannonia, Diocletian in 285 makes Nicomedia in Asia Minor his permanent residence. But in order to secure the West, a general whom he had already made Caesar was proclaimed co-emperor or Augustus over the whole of the western empire. This man was Maximianus; he was already, it seems, in Gaul, and, though the exact date is somewhat uncertain, his elevation is generally placed in the following year (286). In the same year Maximian, harassed with difficulties on the Rhine and in Gaul, entrusted the fleet to a captain or admiral named Carausius of Menapia, with the object of suppressing piracy on the north and north-west of Gaul. Before long it was discovered that Carausius was conniving at the depredations of these Frankish and Saxon pirates, and so finding, with his fleet at Boulogne, means of enriching himself and strengthening his hold upon his army. To escape the death sentence threatened by Maximian he took the daring step of conveying his fortunes, his fleet, and his army over the Channel to Britain, where he found a ready welcome and was proclaimed Augustus. Once more for Britain, still only loosely attached to the empire since Aurelian had put an end to the Gallo-Roman, or, as we have named it, the Gallo-Britannic, power, there began a period of independent existence which lasted ten years. From 286 to 296 Britain was a flourishing empire by itself, in friendly intercourse, and carrying on a large export and import trade, with Gaul. We have no inscriptions bearing the name of Carausius, but the very numerous coins of his reign discovered here and in Gaul betoken a time of quiet and of prosperity. The Christians in Britain increased in numbers as the third century wore on; they were spreading, and no persecution disturbed their peace, though Carausius himself was a pagan, as the coins show.[1]

[1] A great number, and of very different types, are well illustrated in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, but large collections have been discovered later; for instance, among the great Selborne find of the

In the month of March, 293, two men were appointed Caesars and were adopted as sons by the Augusti, Galerius by Diocletian, Constantius by Maximian. This Constantius, soldier and politician, in 274, according to the Chronicle of Eusebius and the *Historia Nova* of Zosimus (ii. 8), had made his union with Helena a legitimate one, so that the legitimacy of his son Constantine the Great was secured. However, after nearly twenty years of married life, he was compelled to divorce her in order to marry Theodora, the step-daughter of Maximian. Though great benefits quickly followed the partition, Britain was still a separate empire under Carausius. Constantius determined that he must be suppressed, owing to his alliance with the barbarian Franks and the power he exercised over the important Gallic port of Boulogne. Boulogne was won, and in the same year Carausius was killed by his praetorian prefect, Allectus. As this man succeeded to the title of his victim, Constantius, pursuing his preparations actively on a large scale, was able in 296 to send over the *praefectus praetorio*, Asclepiodotus, who, after landing during a mist on the south coast, soon afterwards defeated and killed Allectus in a battle near London. Constantius, upon his arrival in Britain, won the confidence and loyalty of all, and Britain became again a part of the great Roman empire; yet the conduct of Constantius (now ennobled with the title of Britannicus Maximus), and his policy towards the Britons, must have been determined, to some extent, by the fact that their separation had been to them a time of security and prosperous growth. This also lends probability to the impression that in 303, and after his proclamation as Augustus in May, 305, the Christians of Britain and Gaul were shielded by him from the severities of the Edicts which ushered in the Diocletian persecution. This point is further discussed in Chapter VI.

year 1873, 545 were found to be Carausian. Of coins lately discovered at Llandudno 90 per cent. are said to be his.

CHAPTER I

NON-CHRISTIAN BRITAIN

The province of Britain, in comparison with Ireland or the northern parts of our island, presents a very striking difference from them in the history of its passage from heathenism to Christianity. There was here no single outstanding man who might be called the Apostle of Britain—no St. Patrick, no St. Columba, not even a Nynias. For a truer comparison, as to the coming of the faith, we look to North Africa or Gaul, where, by the work of ordinary men and women, gradually, slowly, and toilsomely the new religion strove to win for itself a fixed place among a population that was non-Christian.[1] In visiting museums, such as that at Great Chesters, near Chollerford on the Tyne, or the rich collection of the Hunterian Museum at Glasgow, or at Carlisle, Chester on Dee, Caerleon on Usk, and other places, we are deeply impressed, on the one hand, by the religious character of the Remains, and on the other with the almost entire absence of any reference whatever to the Christian religion. The earliest Christians came, as one may believe, about A.D. 180–200, into a Britain which had been Romanized, and found in this fact their greatest help and their greatest difficulty. Their progress was facilitated by the opportunities furnished in a country administered as a Roman province; but heathenism was to the front, nay universal in actual life, alike in the army and in the municipal organizations, and in the family life of Britons and provincials.

We are considering a period marked roughly by the death of Marcus Aurelius (180) and the death at York of the Emperor Septimius Severus (211), both of whom had been persecutors of the Christians. The Christian immigrants who then came to Britain saw a heathen country

[1] See Monceaux, *Histoire Litt. de l'Afrique Chrétienne*, i. pp. 6–9. There were Christian communities in Africa before the conditions implied in Tertullian's words: 'habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas praesto est,' *De Praescr. Haeret.* 36.

of a varied type. There was that of the men brought here by the Roman occupation—officials of the civil administration, the military officers and troops of the Second, Sixth, and Twentieth Legions together with their auxiliaries. M. Fustel de Coulanges emphasizes the fact that within a comparatively short time the Roman legions serving in Gaul were moved to the Rhine, there to remain as a defensive force along that convenient border against the German barbarians, one cohort alone, quartered at Lyon, remaining within the country. A similar arrangement of exclusively frontier fortresses prevailed in Britain: the Twentieth Legion was posted at Deva, whence its auxiliaries issued forth to guard Cheshire, South Lancashire, and North Wales; Isca Silurum, with the Secunda Augusta and auxiliaries, held South Wales and that part of the southern West of England which stretches westward from Bath; in the north the Sixth Legion was quartered at York, and its auxiliary forces kept watch against the Brigantes who dwelt to the north, and against those Caledonian marauders that threatened to throw down and cross the Wall of Hadrian. All the country stretching from these lines to the sea, east and south-east, comparatively speaking, was without troops and, probably, more Romanized, and more rapidly Romanized, than other parts. Settled civilian life with its trade and arts would be found in most of those towns of which the names at least are known to history. Wroxeter (Viroconium) is a town on the western border line; Caerwent is within it. To the east are the four *coloniae* which Britain possessed, viz. Glevum (Gloucester), Camulodunum (Colchester), Lindum (Lincoln), and Eboracum (York), the northernmost. Besides these there were the towns of Londinium, Chichester—bearing in Latin the name *Regni*, the name also of the British tribe which peopled the locality—Venta Belgarum, Calleva (Silchester), St. Alban's (Verulamium)—the single *municipium* in Britain—Cirencester (Durocornovium), Venta Silurum, and Bath (Aquae Sulis). An interesting inscription has preserved for us evidence that Caerwent was a centre for the tribe of the Silures, who continued to

live on around it as a *civitas* administered by an *ordo*; the inscription runs: 'ex decreto ordinis reipublicae civitatis Silurum.'[1]

Historians have emphasized the fact that the existence, not only of towns, but also of roads, has played no small part in the advance of Christianity.[2]

Besides what has been said of towns, we observe in respect of Romano-British roads that northward of York only a few had been constructed, of which Watling Street and the Maiden Way, still preserving their structure and lines, were the principal highways, though several subsidiary roads are shown in local maps. What is now the Principality of Wales lay within three, if not four, roads, forming roughly the sides of a parallelogram, and the sea. There was a high road from Chester on the Dee through Viroconium to Caerleon on Usk, with roads from Deva to Caernarvon along the coast of North Wales, and from Caerleon to Caermarthen in the south. From Caernarvon or Conovium (Conwy) southwards ran a road still termed in different places *Sarn Helen*, though its course cannot be accurately traced. Besides these it is difficult to trace any other, except the road from Caerleon, through Brecon, to Caermarthen.[3] As to the remainder, east of the line from Deva to Caerleon and south of York, a good map shows quite a network of roads. From London a Roman or British trader or soldier might travel towards the eastern coast to Durovernum and thence find three roads to three different ports; westward he would travel to Calleva, where he could branch out on the left to Venta Belgarum and the sea, or proceed to Bath, or by a north-westerly course to Gloucester (Glevum), passing by 'Akeman Street' on the left and the 'Fosse' on the right at Durocornovium. Another route led from London along the road afterwards called

[1] See *Athenaeum*, Sept. 26, 1903.

[2] Ramsay, *Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*; the missionary routes followed the line of imperial roads in Asia Minor and in Europe.

[3] Watkin's *Roman Cheshire* and *Roman Lancashire* give a full account of Roman roads from Deva to Manchester and elsewhither—Wilderspool (Veratinum), Wigan (Coccium), &c. For the road through Brecon we have the interesting evidence of milestones, *C. I. L.* vii. 1161, 1162.

Watling Street to Viroconium, and thence through Manchester to York and further north. The Ermine Street (to use its later name) carried the wayfarer from Colchester (also connected with London) through Lincoln to York; the 'Fosse' connected Watling Street and Ermine Street at Lincoln. The Bishop of York and the Bishop of Lincoln would travel along the last-named road to meet their brother of London on their way to the Council of Arles in 314. This is but a partial account of the means of communication provided by roads, constructed at different times during the Roman occupation, some undoubtedly as early as, if not even earlier than, the reign of Hadrian, and all apparently previous to the time of Diocletian[1] (284–305).

Now it is in these parts, the earliest and most fully Romanized portions of Britain, that we might expect to find the earliest Christians, and the earliest Christian communities of Britain. M. Fustel de Coulanges writes of Gaul as follows: 'When Christianity penetrated into Gaul it did not find there on the one hand a Roman religion, on the other a Gallic religion: it only found a Gallo-Roman religion, that is to say, a polytheism of great complexity and very confused, in which there was not anything specially or exclusively Gallic'.[2] He evidently believed that not only had the Celtic language and Druidism disappeared, but that the Celtic religion of Roman Gaul had become Romanized. This view is now, in part, strongly contested. It is, however, impossible to hold, in the case of Britain, that Christianity found there no religion that was not specially or exclusively Britanno-Roman. Rather, one would say that it met in this island (1) a polytheism that was exclusively Roman, (2) a further polytheism which, though still Roman, was at the same time influenced by local beliefs, and (3) the Celtic religion or religions of the native population; to these must be added, as in continental parts, the worship of oriental deities such as Mithra, Serapis, and Isis.

Gildas, at the beginning of his work on Britain, gives

[1] *C. I. L.* vii, pp. 206, 207, Chapters lxviii–lxxiv; Prof. Oman, *Before the Normans came.*

[2] *La Gaule romaine*, p. 119.

us a significant glimpse of the old heathenism of the country in his day (about A.D. 540). He alludes to its phenomena as things not to be described by him, though, had he given a detailed account of them, he would have won higher appreciation from many than is accorded to him now for what he himself regarded as a far graver task. He will not recount, he tells us, (1) those beliefs which, before the coming of Christ, the Britons held in common with the whole human race, (2) the very numerous remains of old idolatry still surviving inside and outside deserted walls (of temples), (3) the divine honours superstitiously heaped by a blind people upon mountains, valleys, and rivers.[1]

The Christian monk, in the fervour of his soul, would naturally describe the heathen past, of which he saw abundant memorials around him, in terms of this character. More than two centuries had passed since Constantine, leaving hosts of heathen behind, quitted the island to take that perilous march the success of which made him, as Christian emperor, master of the future; nevertheless, though Britain had, by the middle of the next century, become in a sense everywhere Christian except in its more northern parts, Gildas could with ease have given us, from personal knowledge, information of the varied heathen life which the earliest Christians witnessed in this country, far clearer and more ample than anything that can be gathered now. He chose not to give it, and thus other materials must be used, the aim being not so much to present a history of pre-Christian religions in Britain as to give a delineation of those forces in the different religions with which Christianity had to contend before it was able to replace them.

Julius Caesar, who had lived eight years in Gaul and

[1] *De Excid. Brit.* 4 'Igitur omittens priscos illos communesque cum omnibus gentibus errores, quibus ante adventum Christi in carne omne humanum genus obligabatur astrictum, nec enumerans patriae portenta ipsa diabolica paene numero Aegyptiaca vincentia, quorum lineamentis deformibus intra vel extra deserta moenia solito more rigentia torvis vultibus intuemur, neque nominatim inclamitans montes ipsos aut colles aut fluvios olim exitiabiles, nunc vero humanis usibus utiles, quibus divinus honor a caeco tunc populo cumulabatur.'

had himself held the office of *pontifex*, has left in the *De Bello Gallico* some descriptive details of the religion of the Celts in Gaul. In the midst of popular beliefs, without system probably, and with illimitable variations, he recognizes certain characters and attributes corresponding with those of Roman deities. 'Concerning these (Apollo, Mars, Jupiter, Minerva) they have much the same conception as other nations have.'[1] It is quite possible that, had he lived in Britain for a length of time, he might have written in the same strain of the religion or religions that would have come under his observation here. We are, moreover, speaking of a time when the island had been a Roman province for a century and a half, when Britain and a large part of Roman or Romanized Gaul were settling down to a peaceable life in common. The earliest Christians, being immigrants, came here as Romanized or as actual Romans, continuing to live in Britain under conditions of social and political intercourse not dissimilar from those to which they had been previously accustomed. The majority of people around them were heathen, and the pagan surroundings of temples, altars, priests, processions, and the low, repulsive obscenities of the circus and theatre, were familiar to them; not infrequently a pagan and a Christian may have lived in ties of close friendship, such as the two lawyer friends who, as described in the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix (*c.* A.D. 190), used to leave Rome during the vacation, when the courts were not sitting, to spend some time at the seaside, and in the intervals of watching the children playing 'ducks and drakes' on the shore, used to hold earnest discourse about Christianity and heathenism.

Our leading records of the heathenism which prevailed in Britain are to be found in the books which describe the various inscriptions and remains of antiquity discovered here. When we turn the pages of Hübner's vol. vii of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, or its supplementary companion *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, or the bulky *Lapi-*

[1] *De Bello Gallico*, vi. 17. I am not forgetting that doubt has been thrown on Caesar's account; there are, however, good reasons for accepting him as a primary witness.

darium Septentrionale, published by the antiquaries of North Britain, we soon feel, and, with closer acquaintance, the impression deepens, that we are reading records which are essentially religious but exclusively non-Christian. This fact, however, can in no way imply the non-existence of Christians, because many inscriptions in other countries, of which the dates can be ascertained, belong to a time when Christian churches are known to have been long established in those countries, and yet the inscriptions give not the slightest indication of the fact. Such was the case in Britain. The inscriptions are for the most part military or official, and while the army would be a close corporation, severely excluding all that was not peculiar to itself, every record of an official character would be prescribed by old traditional formulas. There are pathetic words of a husband who mourns for an affectionate and faithful wife; of servants who tell the virtues of departed masters; of masters who record devoted service on the part of servants; yet all this is heathen, or the phraseology is heathen.

We observe the following facts. First, the majority of memorials refer us to a purely Roman heathenism or to the heathenism of Romanized provincials from other countries, such as Gaul, or Spain, or the Rhine. Only a few instances need be given. At Bath we find a dedication by a 'citizen of Treves (*civis Trever*)' to Mars Loucetius and the goddess Meletona, both names reminiscent of his old home; at the same place a temple, well constructed, as its ruins show, and with an inscription of finely cut letters, which Hübner believes to be of the second century, is rebuilt at their own cost by the priests, after the restoration of their college, and dedicated *deae Sulis Minervae*. At Caerleon (Isca) Postumius Varus, who is supposed to be the city praefect named by 'the Chronographer of 354'[1] for the year 271, restores a temple of Diana; the form of the incised lettering (*litterae elegantes*) is also regarded as fixing this restoration at some time in the third century, probably after 271.[2]

[1] Mommsen's edition of *Chronica Minora*.

[2] *C. I. L.* vii. 36, 39, 95.

Other examples, many in number, might be cited of dedicatory tablets and altars which remind us how general in all parts was the worship, or, at least, the formal recognition, of Roman heathen deities. I pass by the few Greek inscriptions; some, even of these, are purely Roman in character.

Out of about a dozen inscribed stones which give the name of the Phrygian god Mithra, whose worship is found so widely dispersed, I select the following. He is described as the invincible associate of Sol or as *Sol invictus*: a stone preserved at Durham, but discovered at Rochester in the north, tells of a dedication to Mithra, as the 'invincible god associate of Sol', for the safety of M. Aurelius Antoninus Pius Imperator, who is probably Elagabalus. The stone therefore belongs to A.D. 219–22. An altar preserved at Caerleon is also dedicated to the same sun-god Mithra, and may have been erected about A.D. 200.[1] The religion of this deity, though accompanied with some revolting practices, was widely accepted as bringing to men something more real and more personal than the older religions. There were in it comfort and help for sinners and sufferers, there was promise of immortality with the ascended god. Still it was not fully monotheistic, nor was it ethically strong; though an approach to Christianity, it was on a lower level. A stone of about the same date is found at York amid the foundations of a Roman house. It commemorates the building of a temple to Serapis by Cl. Hieronymianus, a legatus of the Sixth Legion. Polytheism, we find from these examples, was in Britain, as elsewhere, accommodating. Thus no Roman, from emperor to common soldier, felt the least compunction in adopting the worship of the deities of other nations, a fact of which there is abundant evidence. On the other hand, as is plainly shown in the history of the occupation of Gaul, the Celts in their polytheism would be equally ready to adapt themselves to the worship of deities which the Romans constantly brought to their knowledge.

The names of such deities as Jupiter, Mercurius, Apollo,

[1] *C. I. L.* vii. 1039, 99. A full summary of the history of Mithraism will be found in Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Empire*, pp. 47–57.

Mars, Minerva, Hercules, appear in Gaul with the addition of other names of Celtic origin. So also in Britain we have Jupiter Taranus, Taranucus; Dolichenos; Mercurio deo Andescoci; Apollo Maponus; Mars Britovius, Toutates, Beladonnis, Cocidius, Condatis, Nodons, Rigisamus, Barrex, Braciaca, Corotiacus, Olloudios; Hercules Magasunus, Saegon; Minerva Belisama, Sulevia, Sulis. Very curious inscriptions, found at Lydney Park in Gloucestershire, have been interpreted as showing that Mars in that locality was worshipped as Mars Nodons (Nodens), or they may indicate simply a local god Nodons, of whom we seem to have reminiscences in the Irish *Nuadu* and the British *Nudd* and *Lludd*.[1] So also Taranus or Taranis, as an epithet of Jupiter, and Sulis of Minerva, found both in the British vol. vii and the Gallic vol. xiii of the *Corpus*, lead us respectively to *taran* (*thunder*) and to *heol* = *haul* (*sun*).[2] In these instances of a Latin name given to a British divinity—and their number might be multiplied—we seem to find traces of Britons who had become Romanized in their religion, though also, probably, of Romans who, in some way, had been drawn into companionship with people dominated by strong British ideas.

In the next place, besides the Britonized Roman and the Romanized Briton, we have further to take into account the native Briton, unaffected to a greater or less extent by Roman influence. The parallel case of Gaul, where Romanizing influences were incomparably more extensive and potent, may help us in this question. As the Franks and other barbarians were occupying Gaul, attention was directed to the common people of the open country, and when, among others, Caesarius of Arles[3] carried the

[1] *C. I. L.* vii. 84, 977, 61, 137, 140, 925, 93, 73, 318, 746, 885, 1080, 6. Loth, *Les Mabinogion*, i, p. 252, n. 2. Rhys, *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 119-33.

[2] The *Matres* or *Suleviae*, revered by the legionaries as givers of harvest, are Celtic, but not peculiarly British. See Haverfield, *Archaeol. Aeliana*, xv (new series), p. 324; Bertrand, *La Religion des Gaulois: Le Culte des Eaux*, pp. 191 ff.

[3] Cf. Arnold, *Caesarius von Arelate*, pp. 154 ff.; also 166-82. The first chapters of Hauck's *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* are on this

mission of the Gospel to them, it was found that they were still, in the main, heathen and spoke Celtic. If this was the case in Gaul much more might it be in Britain. There was a Celtic religion in this island, and a Celtic religion of the kind known as nature religion, wherein the forces and activities observable in nature were, in an indefinite way, regarded as supernatural powers. But it is extremely difficult to acquire any very definite notion of its character, especially if detached from the information supplied us respecting the characteristics found generally in the tracts, all formerly Celtic, which we now know as Germany, North Italy, the Low Countries, Spain and France. It would be well not only to search what ancient writers say respecting the religion of Celts or Britons in particular, but also, maybe with equally instructive results, to observe those numerous forms of heathenism which so persistently mingled with the Christianity of common life, and from which Christian bishops sought so earnestly to cleanse the people and the Church after the countries had become Christian. Caesarius in Gaul, Samson in Wales, Patrick in Ireland, by this earnest warfare of theirs, indirectly instruct us as to the character of pre-Christian heathenism.

The Britons had—as the Welsh language still has—the old name which designated the divine for the Indo-European peoples. To us to-day God is *Duw*; to them of old the generic name was *dewos* with its primary meaning of 'brightness'.[1] There were probably many and various other ideas connected with this divinity who among tribes of Celtic lineage bore a similar or dissimilar name, yet with the common attribute of brightness. Thus it might have been possible for supernatural powers, with individual Celtic names, to possess some attributes which might

point very instructive. As to the comparative Romanization of the two countries, a glance at vol. xiii after vol. vii of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Lat.* is decisive.

[1] The progress of ages is frequently seen by the mere juxtaposition of words: in this way, while *Duw* is Indo-Germanic, *duwdod* comes from *deitatem* (*deitas*) of Latin Christian theology, just as *trindod* from *trinitatem*; *trined* belongs to Roman times.

suggest to Julius Caesar the five Roman deities named by him (*De Bello Gallico*, vi. 17). Of this possibility the inscriptions mentioned above seem to bear witness, yet it must be regarded as a very rough and inadequate generalization.

Several ancient writers mention the Celtic custom of offering human sacrifices to the gods; this was an undoubted fact, yet it might well be a survival of similar undesirable rites, belonging to a common past, which had ceased, and in extensive areas had been forgotten. Their views as to the immortality of the soul, though emphasized, were not peculiar to them, but the Pythagorean stamp in those views is difficult to explain.

We should give special consideration to the fact that it was not the leading or highest deities among them which constituted the chief difficulty in the way of Christianity. These, as was the case with the chief Roman and Greek deities, easily yielded their place to 'God the Father, Creator of heaven and earth', as the Christians taught their catechumens. It was the humbler powers, which were nearer the people, with a host of usages, prayers, and incantations intertwined with the joys, fears, anxieties and hopes of everyday life, powers that were constantly resorted to in stunning crises that brought consternation and alarm—it was the stubborn prevalence of these lower deities which at times drove Christian pastors almost to despair. The Britons may have found some beliefs and rites of this class among those who dwelt here before them, which were absorbed and persisted long among masses of men and women. The typical mode of conversion in a nation has, too often, been represented as taking place in the following way. A missionary comes, or is sent, to the heathen of the country; first the king is converted, then the leading men all follow his example; lastly, the people in a body embrace the faith and are baptized without delay. The process was as a rule quite otherwise. Though the propagation, for various reasons unknown to us, was far speedier in some countries than in others, yet the task was generally slow, toilsome, and incomplete. We have evidence in the Tripartite Life of St. Patrick, and in the British (or Breton)

Life of Samson, of the religious hindrances presented by popular beliefs and the customs which still held their place in the imagination of the masses; but the Sermons of St. Caesarius of Arles among a people that was like the Britons at once both Celtic and Roman, will more specifically illustrate and help us to realize those peculiar religious ideas and usages which from the first, as their continuance proves, impeded the progress of the religion that was to triumph. In these Sermons we have contemporary evidence, and a few of the facts they bring before us will make plain the main points of resistance offered by heathenism to the work of Christianizing a people.

The terror of the masses when an eclipse of the sun or moon occurred was accompanied by loud cries on their part for help against the warring heavenly bodies. This custom was of an essentially heathen origin, and lasted long. 'When the moon is eclipsed,' Caesarius preaches, 'you observe how some at this break into shouts; then admonish them, pointing out how they commit a grave sin when they believe that they can by their cries defend the moon from evils in accordance with a sacrilegious attempt; show how the moon, by the command of God, is obscured at fixed times.' These cries were, however, common to Celts and Romans. The inferior Celtic gods, moreover, known in popular songs and tales as denizens of cliffs, fountains, seas and woods, were near the peasant and his wife, ready to be invoked in times of common perils. 'If at the present day,' says Caesarius to the people, 'you see some reciting their vows to fountains and trees, speak to them severely of such sins on their part, and tell them that whosoever does this loses the grace of baptism. . . . Christians ought not to make vows to trees, nor pray at a well, if they desire to be saved through the grace of God from eternal punishment.' We are reminded here of the words of Gildas already quoted (p. 34), respecting 'the divine honours superstitiously heaped by a blind people upon mountains, valleys, and rivers', words which serve to connect Britain and Gaul. The old feast-days remained, and when they had become simply days of relaxation, they obstinately kept, with a touch

of the old heathen character, their accustomed place, and the pastor preaches 'that though a man fast, though he pray, though he yoke himself to the Church, though he give alms, though he crucify his body with every pain, it shall profit him nothing, so long as he observes those impious sacrilegious practices'. Thursday was observed as a day in honour of Zeus or Jupiter as the name signified—*dies Iovis, di Iau* = *diviau* or *dydd Iau*—and it was difficult to get the husbandman to till, or the woman to weave, on that day. Some days were propitious for launching a ship, some for beginning a journey; the preacher, therefore, has with practical wisdom to warn and guide: 'Let none of you think on what day he leaves his house, nor on what day he returns thither, because God has made all days good.'

Magic was universally present, and the wizard constantly at hand, to cure the cows, to heal the serpent's bite, to drive away demons, and, of course, to receive rich rewards in secret. Long also did these and other superstitious practices remain. The Church's first great difficulties would be found in these common usages, and its work of clearing and purging the land might have been sooner accomplished but for the fact that even highly placed teachers and ecclesiastics themselves shared in the superstitious temper of the early centuries.[1]

Of Britain there is a somewhat different tale to tell. At the time when Gildas wrote, one may gather, the credulities he describes were all, or mostly all, of the past, and in the grave charges he brings against the five princes, his denunciation nowhere implies that they conformed to heathen practices; had that been the case, even their sins would have been less abhorrent to him. But it is about this very time, when the British writer can thus write of heathen ideas he regards as dead, that the Gallic bishop of Arles and the surrounding district is compelled to preach so many sermons against the persistent heathen superstition.

There is another side of heathenism which, without obviously involving any views respecting the deity or

[1] See Dr. Bigg's *Wayside Sketches in Eccles. History*, on the credulity of even such men as Cyprian and Paulinus of Nola, pp. 47, 175, &c.

divine powers, is, notwithstanding, closely connected with the religion of the heathen population. There were habits of indulgence in bodily pleasures which heathenism, as such, had even encouraged; adultery was no sin, and concubinage was allowed by philosophy, by temple, and by senate. The wife was in a position of cruel inequality through the licence legally allowed to the husband; as Jerome said later, 'the laws of the Caesars are different from the laws of Christ.'[1] The chaste Christian marriage, taught and demanded from the first by every preacher of the Christian evangel, would find the religion of heathendom, by the easy indulgence it allowed, an obstacle of no mean power in the way of its propagation and victory.[2]

For the full appreciation of our subject it is necessary to form a clear idea of Druidism. The custom of calling old Celtic-British remains 'druidical' may, in part, be correct; but, as a mode of generic designation, it must be erroneous. The Druids can scarcely be regarded as men who performed religious functions. They were not priests;[3] they were a corporate body of 'wise men' who, though of necessity connected with the religion of their fellow countrymen, hardly stood in that relation which would lead us to classify the ancient Celtic religion of Britain as 'druidical', nor ought the remains, if we speak correctly, to be termed 'druidic'.

In estimating the importance of Druidism as an element in the religion of the insular branch of the great Celtic family we have to base our conclusions on intimations

[1] *Ep.* 77 'Aliae sunt leges Caesarum, aliae Christi. Aliud Papinianus, aliud Paulus praecipit.' Quoted by Schultze, *Gesch. des Untergangs des Heidentums*, ii, p. 40.

[2] The subject of which these last pages treat may be read in:—
Sermones S. Caesarii, Migne, tome xxxix.
Arnold (Carl Fr.), *Caesarius von Arelate.*
Malnory (A.), *Saint Césaire Évêque d'Arles*, pp. 221-8.
Schultze (Victor), *Gesch. des Untergangs des Heidentums*, Band ii.
Rhys (Sir John), *Celtic Heathendom.*

[3] M. Bertrand is somewhat severe on 'l'imagination des celtisants', but seems himself to take for granted that 'les druides étaient prêtres'.

derived from three sources. In the first place we may study the statements, more or less definite, on the subject made by ancient writers from Aristotle to Clement and Cyril of Alexandria. Secondly, we mark the fairly unanimous deductions of Celtic philology as to the meaning of the term *Druid*. Then, thirdly, the fact that Druidism lived on in Ireland down to historical times gives certain well-marked features to be kept in mind whatever inferences are drawn from the two other sources.

The authors whose works contain the information upon which we draw may be classed as follows :—

Writers before the Christian era.

Aristotle and Sotion in a quotation made by Diogenes Laertius, who himself wrote in the second century after Christ (*Proemium* 1). Aristotle, if the passage be genuine, carries us back to B. C. 384–322; Sotion lived in the second century B. C. Posidonius, from Apamea in Syria, a Stoic philosopher, after travels which gave him into a first-hand knowledge of Gaul, wrote his ἱστορίαι in fifty-two books.

Julius Caesar gives the fullest account in the *De Bello Gallico*, vi. 13, 14, 16, 17; *c.* B. C. 50.

Cicero, in the *De Divinatione*, i. 41, 90; *c.* B. C. 44.

Diodorus Siculus wrote in Greek a General History from the beginning of Caesar's wars in Gaul and his expedition to Britain, Book v. 21 ff.

Timagenes, a writer of about B. C. 14, from whose *History of Gaul* quotations are made by Ammianus Marcellinus, Book xv. 9, 4.

Writers after Christ.

Strabo, author of the Γεωγραφικά in seventeen books; the events narrated come down to A. D. 23.

Pomponius Mela, a Spaniard, who wrote the oldest work in Latin on Geography, probably about 43–4. His book ends with a victorious expedition against Britain by 'the mightiest of emperors (*principum maximus*)', and a triumph to be celebrated for 'the opening of the closed island'.

Lucan (M. Annaeus) was a nephew of the philosopher Seneca, born at Corduba A. D. 39. Besides other works, Lucan wrote an Epic poem of which the poetic value is small, called *Pharsalia*, upon the war between Caesar and Pompey in ten books. The poet is mentioned by Jerome as one on whose works commentaries were written (c. Ruf. ii. 47); he is twice quoted by Henry of Huntingdon in the *Historia Anglorum*.

Pliny; about A. D. 77 Pliny's *Historia Naturalis* was published, a kind of encyclopaedia, of which Books xvi. 249–57; xxiv. 103–4; xxx. 4, 13, contain passages treating of the Druids.

Suetonius, in c. 25 of the *Life of the Emperor Claudius*, made an important statement respecting the suppression of Druidism. Suetonius lived under Trajan (A.D. 98–117).

Tacitus the historian produced his greatest works during the reigns of Nerva (96–8) and Trajan (98–117). These are the *Life of Agricola*, the *Histories*, and the *Annals*. Book xiv. 30 of the latter describes the frenzied action of the Druids of Anglesey when Suetonius Paulinus, after crossing the Menai, attacked their island; the *Histories*, iv. 54, make a passing allusion to the Druids of Gaul.

Dio Chrysostom was a Greek contemporary of Tacitus, living under the emperors from Vespasian to Trajan. A rhetorician and sophist by training, he also studied philosophy and the ethics of his time. Some 79 *Orationes* (Dindorf's ed.) of his are extant; in Oratio xlix he speaks of the Celtic Druids.

Two Church Fathers also mention Druidism, but as an institution they knew of it only by reading; their information, therefore, is merely that of the Greek source they draw upon. One of them, Clement of Alexandria (died about 216), was a universal inquirer: the other, Hippolytus of Rome, is chiefly known by his *Philosophumena* and Commentaries; his death is placed about 237.

Many of the passages in the works of these writers which bear upon our subject are printed in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*.

Among modern writers we name Rhys, *Studies in Early English History*; also, *Irish History* (*Proceedings of Brit. Academy*, vol. i. p. 34 ff.); *Celtic Heathendom* by Reinach in *Revue Celtique*, vol. xxi. pp. 173 ff.; Bertrand, *La Religion des Gaulois: Les Druides et le Druidisme*, pp. 252–96; D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Les Druides*, pp. 12 ff.; Anwyl, *Celtic Religion*.

The system which we connect with the Druids must have been somewhat limited in area; though the Celts, before the great changes that took place within historical times, covered a very large part of Western Europe, from Ireland to lands beyond the Rhine, if not to the Danube, yet Druidism never existed except in Trans-Alpine Gaul, Britain and Ireland. This limitation is a very significant fact, and has suggested the hypothesis that Druidism in our island belonged to an earlier race of inhabitants than the Britons.

Our fullest and sanest source of information is the well-known Book vi of Caesar's *De Bello Gallico*, for it is written by an eyewitness. Other writers, more ancient, make mention of the Druids. The fragment of Aristotle, if genuine, describes the reverence in which they were held. Diodorus Siculus, a writer of the age of Augustus, quotes from Alexander Polyhistor—as also does Clement of

Alexandria—remarks which connect certain opinions held by the Druids with those that had become popular under the name of Pythagoras, such as the belief in the transmigration of souls. Clement simply quotes the expressions which represent the Druids as among the pioneers of philosophy in this Pythagorean opinion: the Egyptians had their 'prophets', the Assyrians their 'Chaldaeans', the Gauls their 'Druids'.[1] They stand in these and other words of Clement side by side with *magi* and philosophers. The further description leads us to place them in the same category as the augurs of the Romans and other peoples who practised diverse modes of divination. The same notion of a resemblance in their ideas to Pythagorean doctrines is found in the *Philosophumena*—not of Origen, to whom several writers still ascribe the words, but of Hippolytus, who in turn also derived his information from older writers, with a similar addition as to the use of magic. The affirmation of Diodorus that 'some, whom they call Druids, are very highly honoured as philosophers and theologians'[2] is repeated by Hippolytus, the real author of the work formerly assigned to Origen. 'The Druids,' he says, 'among the Celts have devoted themselves greatly to the philosophy of Pythagoras . . . these the Celts regard as prophets and seers. . . . The Druids also make use of magic.'[3]

The more sober account of Caesar, drawn from personal acquaintance, is somewhat as follows: The Druids are concerned with divine things, have oversight of public and private sacrifices, and give interpretations of religious questions: they also decide in cases of crime, of inheritance, of boundaries, and other such matters. He several times calls the institution a *disciplina*, a term that implies a

[1] *Stromateis* i. 15. 70, 71 καὶ Ἀσσυρίων οἱ χαλδαῖοι καὶ Γαλατῶν (= Celts) οἱ δρυίδαι καὶ . . .

[2] Φιλόσοφοί τέ τινές εἰσι καὶ θεολόγοι περιττῶς τιμώμενοι οὓς δρυίδας ὀνομάζουσι, Diod. v. 31.

[3] The *Philosophumena* or *Refutatio* of Hippolytus may have been written about 225, and is therefore somewhat earlier than any writing of Origen's. Δρυίδαι οἱ ἐν Κέλτοις τῇ Πυθαγορείῳ φιλοσοφίᾳ κατ' ἄκρον ἐγκύψαντες . . . Τούτους Κέλτοι ὡς προφήτας καὶ προγνωστικοὺς δοξάζουσιν . . . χρῶνται δὲ δρυίδαι καὶ μαγείαις. *Philosoph.* i. 25.

corporate life, organization as well as the possession of learning. The *disciplina*, he says, had been imported into Gaul from Britain, whither also those who desired a more perfect initiation resorted: such training extended over several years and necessitated committing thousands of verses to memory; writing was, as a rule, avoided, but when it was employed Greek letters were used. They teach that souls do not perish, but enter into other bodies at death; besides this they teach many things concerning the stars and their motion, the magnitude of the world and lands, and the power of the immortal gods. The immolation of human victims is frequent.[1] Cicero in the *De Divinatione* finds the same investigation of nature ('quam *φυσιολογίαν* Graeci appellant') and the practice of augury for the determination of the future.[2] Mela also, while calling the Druids the 'teachers of wisdom', in his characterization of their tenets follows Caesar, or even more closely Cicero.[3] The poet Lucan, in the dozen or fewer lines of his preserved, seems to me, in the same way, to be simply reproducing Caesar.[4]

Timagenes and Diodorus show acquaintance with a division, found in Strabo's *Geographica*, into three classes—*bardi*, *vates*, *druidae*: the *bardi* were writers of hymns; the *vates* or *seers* occupied themselves with performing sacred rites and the work appertaining to *physiologi*; the *druidae* were devoted to the study of nature and ethical philosophy, and were also honourably entrusted with decisions in cases of justice and war.[5] Priesthood, it seems to me, cannot be connected with any functions appertaining to the Druids, though they presided over sacrifices with the object of

[1] *De Bello Gallico*, vi. 13, 14.

[2] Cicero, *De Divin.* i. 41, 90 (Nobbe's edn.).

[3] Pompon. Mela, iii. 2. 18.

[4] Lucan, *Pharsalia*, i. 447–59 (*Mon. Hist. Brit.* p. xc).

[5] Strabo, *Geogr.* iv. 4, 5 *τρία φῦλα τῶν τιμωμένων, βάρδοι τε καὶ οὐάτεις καὶ δρυίδαι.*

The strange blunder of writing *ovates* for the second, where *οὐ* is simply the Latin *v*, has been too long among us. In Welsh we yet speak of *ofydd*, thus perpetuating a palpable error of writing and a misleading classification.

securing certain formalities, the absence of which would make the rite invalid and inefficient. Priests they were not.

The long account of Pliny, except for his description of curious religious rites, his contempt for which he does not hide, points in the same direction—the Druids are wise men closely connected with religion, with public rites, with magic, sorcery, and medical cures by the aid of charms. 'Nihil habent *Druidae—ita suos appellant magos*—visco et arbore in qua gignatur, si modo sit robur, sacratius . . . enimvero quidquid agnoscatur illis (roboribus) a caelo missum putant, signumque esse electae ab ipso deo arboris. . . . Sacerdos candida veste cultus arborem scandit, falce aurea demetit.'[1] This reverence for the mistletoe, cut with a golden sickle, as the passage implies, by a priest—not by a Druid—in white garment, is a feature proper to the Celtic religion *as taught by the Druids.* Pliny, writing the *Historia Naturalis* about the year A.D. 77, because he regarded his work as of an encyclopaedic character, compiled from a vast number of earlier writers, thought it right to insert these details.

The vivid description of awful prayers with hands uplifted to heaven, when Suetonius crossed the Menai into the dense groves of Mona—*saevis superstitionibus sacri*—is familiar to readers of Tacitus and other writers.[2] The Druids were a surprise. M. Bertrand asks, 'What importance could this small island have except as a home of the Druids?' He regards Mona as a noted dwelling-place of a druidic fraternity, finding in this fact the motive for the Roman attack upon it. But Tacitus himself seems to give quite another reason; it offered, he relates, an asylum for fugitives of the Ordovices—*receptaculum perfugarum.*

We have in these references seen grounds to conclude that 'Druidism' was not a religion, whether in Gaul or in Britain, although *all* learning in ancient times was, in a way difficult for us to comprehend, most closely associated with religion.

Philology makes an interesting contribution to the subject: *Druid* (British *derwydd*, Lat. *druida*, Gr. δρυίδης or

[1] Pliny, *Historia Naturalis*, xvi. 249. [2] Tac. *Annals*, xiv. 30.

δρυίδης) goes back to an intensifying prefix *dar-*, *dru-*, meaning *very*, in composition with *vid* which bears the implication *knowing*, so that the term conveys some such meaning as 'very wise'.[1] Its connexion with δρῦς oak, or the Welsh *derw*, seems, according to this view, to be simply incidental. There is, however, another hypothesis, held by Professor Rhys, which regards the *i* of *drui*, on account of the hiatus—so he represents it—between *u* and *i*, as part of the root of the word. The word *druid*, he holds, is not Celtic, but a term adopted by the Celts from some earlier population of the countries conquered by them.

Certain problems, referring to the hypothesis of a Goidelic population as the earlier race in Britain, held to have been conquered by later comers, a Gallic people called Britons, about 200 or 300 years B. C., who found Druidism already flourishing here among the Goidels, interesting though they be, can only be briefly mentioned in these pages. The origin of Druidism does not concern us.

No sacred book of the Druids has been preserved; probably because no such book could exist, in accordance with what Caesar tells us in the *De Bello Gallico* of their extreme reserve, far beyond all that is implied in the supposed early Christian *disciplina arcani*. Still it is a matter of regret that those many verses of theirs—'magnus numerus versuum'—have been lost. No saying, no song, not even an inscription has been preserved. Druidism died early, first in Gaul, then in Britain. It is in no way improbable that Christianity never encountered any opposition from it in this island.[2] In Ireland we have a different story, which will be dealt with later.

Druidism being, according to Caesar's account, a *disciplina*, had a kind of corporate life under one supreme head. M. Bertrand, however, is certainly wrong in connecting the rise of monachism and monasteries with this corporate

[1] See Thurneysen, quoted in Arnold's *Altceltischer Sprachschatz* under *druida*: also in *Les Druides* by de Jubainville.

[2] I have omitted all reference so far to the Welsh *Trioedd* (Triads); they are certainly late and can contain hardly anything original except the imaginative element in them.

feature of Druidism. At first sight such a view appears, as he says, *scientifique*, but it omits the whole long history of monachism. Even as such it was a *collegium*, and could be struck at by the Empire. It is possible to explain the words used first of Tiberius, and afterwards of Claudius, to imply that they aimed at its repression; the measures instituted by the latter could, and probably did, reach Britain. 'Claudius,' Suetonius informs us, 'completely abolished the religion (i. e. the practices) of the Druids with its terrible cruelty, which had only been prohibited to Roman citizens under Augustus.'[1]

M. Fustel de Coulanges has carefully examined these statements in their true connexion. He concludes, rightly, that the interdiction meant a proscription of the sanguinary rites that accompanied the immolation of human victims, and the prohibition of the druidical hierarchy with its corporate organic unity. There was no political persecution or suppression of a religion.[2] It was the Roman occupation that caused Druidism to disappear in Britain, but though it dwindled away as a public organization or a corporate body, it remained to resist Christianity as a form of superstition, preserved in many secret affiliations and customs among the people. Perhaps we have traces of it even now in some curious traditions and usages, which, though not active, live on in remembrance to this day.

In Ireland, judging by the Lives of St. Patrick written by Tirechan and Muirchu maccu Machtheni, the Druids were violently hostile to St. Patrick, and may have existed down to the writers' own time. The Hymns also celebrate his victory over them.[3] It is further recorded that Columba in the sixth century found the magic powers of the Druids

[1] Pliny, *Historia Nat.* xii. 4. 13 'Tiberii Caesaris principatus sustulit eorum druidas et hoc genus vatum medicorumque per senatus consultum.' Suetonius, *Vitae Caesarum, Claudius*, 25 'Dryidarum religionem apud Gallos dirae immanitatis, et tantum civibus sub Augusto interdictam, (Claudius) penitus abolevit.'

[2] *Revue Celtique*, tome iv, pp. 37–59.

[3] *Irish Liber Hymnorum*, i. 100, 105; ii. 32, 36; ed. published by the Henry Bradshaw Society.

arrayed against him at Tara and other places though always to their own dire defeat. Columba can, however, say of the Lord Jesus: 'Christ the Son of God is my Druid.'[1]

Yet an earlier writer in Britain, the author of the *De Excidio*, makes no mention of the Druids either in the passage quoted above or anywhere else. The *Lorica* of Gildas, though bearing his name, was probably not written by him, nevertheless it seems unmistakably British, and differs significantly from the *Lorica* of Patrick;[2] the former incantation (Gildas's), while invoking the aid of the same heavenly powers against enemies, does not mention Druids amongst these: on the other hand the spell in St. Patrick's *Lorica* is expected to act—

> against deceit of idolatry,
> against spells of women and smiths *and Druids*,
> against all knowledge that is forbidden to the human soul.

Divination continued long as an evil against which Christian bishops waged constant warfare. The Druids, whom Patrick held to be deadly enemies, were so regarded because of the assumption that they possessed some heathen supernatural power: they are also termed *magi*, as in Adamnan's *Life of Columba* (c. 37, p. 73 of Reeves' edition). The editor, Dr. Reeves, notes that this is the Latin term always used by Irish writers for *Druids*. Thus in the Irish MS. of the Pauline epistles at Würzburg the gloss on Jannes and Jambres (2 Tim. iii. 8) is 'two Egyptian *druids*'. In the Irish Hymns *druid* means wizard (*Irish Liber Hymnorum*, vol. i, p. 238).

It may be that the persistent hold of such a superstition in Britain, a Christianized land, is attested by the appearance of Druids, if such it be, as wizards in the service of Guorthigirnus[3] and the contemporary Merlin, who accomplishes such wonders by his superior cunning.

[1] Adamnan's *Life of Columba*, Reeves, p. 74; Petrie, *Tara Hill*, 205, 208.

[2] The *Lorica* of Gildas is printed in the Cymmrodorion edition of Gildas, pp. 289-313.

[3] Nennius, *Historia Brittonum*, cc. 39, 40 'Et postea rex ad se invitavit *magos suos*,' &c., &c. The youth, 'born without a father,' who as almost

Christianizing work must have been slow with all this heathen atmosphere around—heathenism, Roman, Britanno-Roman, Mithraic, and the old heathen religious beliefs of the British themselves, with still older tenacious survivals inherited from the earlier race or races.

So far we have only referred to the Roman province of Britain; but north of the boundary (*limes*) formed by the Wall of Hadrian, there dwelt several tribes to which we find the names Caledonii, Maeatae, Picti, and Scotti (?) given. It has been mentioned that the name Caledonia appears in the pages of the *Agricola* of Tacitus, though all the peoples in that part are called Britanni: Dio Cassius gives us Caledonii and Maeatae, but 'Picts and Scots (?)' as of North Britain we meet with for the first time, I believe, in Ammianus Marcellinus (xx. 1). Eyssenhardt appends to his edition of Ammianus an excerpt on Constantius Chlorus which mentions his death at York *post victoriam Pictorum*.

These Scotti were no dwellers in North Britain, but Irish marauders who crossed the sea to join the Picts in their depredations. Even to Gildas in the sixth century they were 'Irish assassins' (*grassatores Hiberni*).[1] By the time of St. Patrick there were *Scotti* who had settled on the north-west coast of northern Britain, and were still heathen. Patrick writes, in holy anger, of their cruelty to newly-baptized Christians, joining with them 'apostate Picts' in the same indignant denunciation.[2] The original heathenism of the Picts was, probably, of the same type as that of the North Irish; they had the same form of Druidism, of which

another wizard foils the king's magi, and gives his name as Ambrosius, is better known as Merlin. Though the mysterious youth had assured the king that he had no father, yet he can also say that his father was a man of Roman consular rank ('unus est pater meus de consulibus Romanicae gentis'), who, we gather, was Embreis Guletic—Emrys Wledig—whom he himself resembled ('ipse videbatur'). In one Codex a rubric is here inserted: *De Merlino dirino*; yet the name Merlin—Merddin of the Trioedd—is nowhere found in the work of Nennius.

[1] Gildas, *De Excidio*, c. 21. So also in the *Panegyric to Constantine*, 11, 251, and Claudian's Poem *De Consulatu Stilichonis*, ii. 251.

[2] *Epistola* of St. Patrick, c. 2, 'socii Scottorum atque Pictorum apostatarum.'

a reminiscence survives still in *Innis nan Druidhneach*—Isle of Druids—the native name for Iona. Their evangelization may have begun about A. D. 400 by the successful labours of a British missionary named Nynia or Nynias (also Ninian), but a partial declension from Christianity had come when St. Patrick, towards the end of his life, wrote the *Epistola.*

The Maeatae, who dwelt between the two walls, are twice mentioned in Adamnan's *Life of Columba* (cc. 8, 9).

CHAPTER II

LEGENDARY ACCOUNTS OF THE COMING OF CHRISTIANITY

Most of the materials for the subjects treated of in this chapter are collected, accompanied by rich and full accounts of their contents, in Ussher, *Britannicarum Ecclesiarum Antiquitates*, cc. i, ii, the first edition of which appeared in 1639, 4to. I have used the edition of 1687, Lond., which corresponds to vol. v of the Whole Works of Archbishop Ussher. Also in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, &c., vol. i, Appendix A, pp. 25-6. These two works, especially the former, bring to our knowledge nearly all that older writers have ventured to say on this topic.

M. l'Abbé Duchesne's edition of the *Liber Pontificalis* in two volumes, with the Introduction, p. cii, gives us the best information on Eleuther and Lucius. The *Liber Pontif.* contains a very early collection of short Lives of the Bishops of Rome, written at different times.

Nova Legenda Anglie, vol. ii, p. 78, collected by John of Tynemouth, John Capgrave, &c., edited by Horstman (1901), gives the legend *De Sancto Joseph de Armathia.*

William of Malmesbury's *De Antiquitate Glast. Ecclesiae* was edited by Gale in 1691 and by Hearne in 1726; also Iohannes Glast. (1400-93). *Chronica sive historia de rebus Glastoniensibus*, was edited by Hearne, 1727. For the Triads I have used Phillimore's edition in the *Cymmrodor*, vol. vii, and the French translation of them by Loth, *Cours de Littérature Celtique*, vol. iii, containing *Les Mabinogion*, i, ii, appendix p. 201. With these the later edition by Gee of the *Myvyrian Archaeology.*

Of tradition, such, for instance, as that which connects St. Mark with the church of Alexandria or certain of the apostles with certain Eastern countries, we have none in the case of Britain. Whenever tradition of a real kind is found, though the reduction of it to writing be comparatively late, all agree that it generally contains a germ of truth; but if we take up even what comes nearest our idea of tradition, we arrive from all points, in the case of our own island, at an impassable bar in the earlier half of the sixth century. Beyond the 'saints', such men as Dubricius, Illtud, Gildas, David, Samson, Teilo, and Padarn, there spreads utter darkness so far as tradition

is concerned. One exception probably there is—that a heathen named Albanus was converted by a Christian fugitive whom he had concealed, and along with others, from Caerleon, suffered martyrdom owing to his and their bold confession of the faith. We can go no further back than the rough date mentioned, and from earlier notices no other event than the death of St. Albanus with Aaron and Julius of Caerleon, can we glean from the field of native tradition. Our gleanings of history respecting the introduction of the Christian religion to our island are hardly more than suppositions, and those from writers outside Britain. Still they have their value. Historic fiction, on the other hand, has been prolific, guesses and inferences have woven stories of marvel. Of these the following pages attempt a recital.

In the case of some countries and cities it is found that the discovery of mythical personages, as the pioneers of Christianity, bears a marked resemblance to the discovery of mythical ancestors of families or peoples. Of this type is the idea that the church in Paris was founded by Dionysius the Areopagite, and that Trophimus was sent to Arles as its first bishop by St. Peter, or Aristobulus to Britain by St. Paul. Such attributions of the founding of churches to 'apostolic' men grew as the centuries advanced, when Trojan and other heroic ancestors were gravely assigned to kings. As to Britain, the previous chapter has placed before us the successive lines of the Roman settlements; we know that the Second Legion was at Isca (Caerleon on Usk), the Twentieth at Deva, and the Ninth at Lincoln, at the time when the mission to the Gentiles was being carried on by St. Paul during his two and a half years at Ephesus (A. D. 54–7).[1]

We thus see the Romanizing of Britain carried early to the Humber, the Dee, and the Severn. We may also, at this point, call to mind that Caratacus with his brother

[1] He wrote the epistle to the church at Rome, probably, in 58, but did not see the great city until 61; afterwards in 63 or 64 he may have visited Spain, returning, after a journey to the East, to Rome, where he was put to death at the end of 66 or the beginning of 67.

Togodumus, sons of Cunobelinus, were defeated by Aulus Plautius in the first year of the invasion, that is, in A. D. 43. When we look into one common form of legend which purports to give some information as to the introduction of the faith into Britain, we find it incongruously connected with both Julius Caesar and with Caradawc (British for Caratacus), and so placed several years, at least, before we have any record of a Christian church even at Rome itself. Other accounts, such, for instance, as those which connect the name of St. Paul or St. Peter with the first preaching of the faith, are not of tradition, they are not even fiction, but somewhat late conclusions drawn from words used by the one and written by ancient writers of the two. Paul speaks in Rom. xv. 24, 28, of an intended visit to Spain; and Clement of Rome, in the Letter of the Church of Rome to the Church at Corinth written by him (*c.* A. D. 95), says:—

ὁ Παῦλος . . . κῆρυξ γενόμενος ἔν τε τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν δύσει τὸ γενναῖον τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ κλέος ἔλαβεν, δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμένων οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου, *Ep. Clem. Rom.* 5.

'Paul having become a preacher both in East and West received the noble glory of his faith when he had taught righteousness to the whole world, and *having come to the limit of the West*, suffered martyrdom at the hands of the rulers and thus passed away from the world.'

Upon the words in italics many, whose names it would be useless to introduce here, have built the hypothesis that St. Paul visited Britain. My simple object is to make plain that the idea of an evangelizing visit by him to Britain is an *inference*, not a tradition. It is, moreover, a conclusion founded upon a very shadowy basis, and the reference to the martyrdom and death in the next clauses seems clearly to indicate Rome as 'the limit of the West', though Spain also may be implied; the journey to Spain is expressly mentioned by the *Fragment of Muratori*, written also at Rome a few years later than the Epistle of Clement, but Britain is not named. As to St. Peter, here again we have inference, not tradition, but of a far slighter texture. Innocent I, Bishop of Rome (401–17) at the time when the Pelagian controversy broke out, in a letter addressed to Decentius, Bishop of Eugubium in Umbria, makes strong claims that the liturgy of the

Roman Church should be the only Latin liturgy. The letter, among other grounds for this claim, asserts that 'over all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, and Sicily and *the interjacent islands*, no one has founded churches except those whom the venerable Apostle Peter or his successors had constituted as priests'.[1] Now on the italicized words has been raised the idea of a visit by Peter to Britain, but *insulas interiacentes*, within the Mediterranean, cannot include Britain.

The conjecture that the *Claudia* mentioned along with Pudens, in 2 Tim. iv, is the same person as the poet Martial's Claudia, who is also the wife of Pudens, can only refer to the possible existence of individual Christians in Britain; it tells nothing of the introduction of Christianity. The Epigram of Martial, xi. 53, speaks of Claudia as being 'from Britain', also as a 'stranger' newly wedded to Pudens in iv. 13. These, it is concluded, must be British Christians at Rome. We cannot tell.[2]

Two other names occur in similar connexion; the first—Simon Zelotes—is mentioned by late writers such as Nicophorus (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, ii. 40) and, with fuller but impossible details, by Dorotheus in the *Synopsis* attributed to him; with them agree the Greek Menologia. In these Greek Menologies the other—Aristobulus—is also named, on March 15, as having been ordained by Paul a bishop for Britain. The Martyrologies tell a very different tale of Simon, representing him as suffering martyrdom, on Oct. 28, in Persia. We are now left, in appearance, with three legends, one English and two British.

The English legend connects itself with the founding of the church of Glastonbury, and is met with first of all in the writings of William of Malmesbury.[3] It is thus post-

[1] *Ep.* 25 *ad Decentium*: the letter is given in Duchesne, *Origines*, p. 82, in Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums*, p. 55.

[2] Claudia caeruleis cum sit Rufina Britannis:
Edita, cur Latiae pectora plebis habet?—xi. 53.
Claudia, Rufe, meo nubit peregrina Pudenti.—iv. 13.

[3] William the monk of Malmesbury was alive when Geoffrey of Monmouth wrote his *Historia*, since he mentions him in the last chapter. The two were intimate friends, and William has borrowed from Geoffrey. His chief work is a History of the Kings of England (A.D. 449–1127, *De*

Norman. But of the existence of an ancient church at the place called by the British *Ynis Gutrin* or *Inis Witrin* there can hardly be any doubt. We may abandon the misleading attempt of Caradoc of Llancarvan in his *Life of Gildas*, which by connecting *gutrin* with *vitrea* (made of glass) gets the name Glastiberia, that is, city of glass. A very early charter is described by William of Malmesbury in his *Gesta Regum Anglorum*, c. 27, which gives the British name as *Ineswitrin* ('sic enim eam Britannice vocari apud eos constat'); in the Historia of the Church of Glastonia, also, he speaks of the place as an island called by the natives Yniswitrin, where Witrin or Gutrin is best regarded as a man's name ('ab incolis Iniswitrin nuncupatam'). Places that had ceased to be insular continued for ages, as in English, to be called by island names, but at the time to which the old charter belonged *ynys* might mean a monastery. *Ynis Witrin* would mean the monastery *of* Witrin, or the Island *of* Witrin.[1] It is possible, therefore, that some confused tradition of this kind had lingered on in a British monastery and that William of Malmesbury is the first to make it known.

William states that he takes the story of the Apostle Philip coming to Gaul (*regionem Francorum*) from Freculphus: Joseph of Arimathea was sent by Philip to Britain 'in the sixty-third year from the Incarnation of the Lord, and fifteenth from the Assumption of the blessed Mary'. The whole story beyond this bears a Norman impress. The disciples with Joseph settle at Ynis Witrin, and, though the king is a pagan and two others that follow him also heathen, yet the missionaries experience kindness. Ussher is copious in his account of the authors who wrote about Joseph and King Aruiragus and Avallon.[2] The mention of

Gestis Regum Angliae) edited by Stubbs, and *Novellae Historiae* (1125–42). Also *De Antiquitate Glastoniensis Ecclesiae* (A.D. 63-1126), which is edited by Gale. He is said to have died in 1142: if Geoffrey wrote two editions of the *Historia*, one in 1139, the other in 1148, William may have died between the former date and the latter.

[1] *Vita Gildae*, c. 14. I may be allowed to refer to the note in my edition of Gildas published by the Cymmrodorion Society, p. 410.

[2] The whole legend, taken from the apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus.

three kings proves that William was here, as elsewhere, intimate with the *Historia* of Geoffrey, who has given them names from father to son, Aruiragus, whose British name is Gweirydd, being the first *paganus*; the two others are Marius, called in the Welsh *Brut* Meuruc, and Coillus, the well-known Coel; then comes, by Geoffrey's account, the first Christian king, great-grandson of Aruiragus, no other than Lucius, or Lles ap Coel as the Welsh records call him.

Joseph, through this connexion with Glastonbury, is carried into the wonderful cycle of literary romances that centre in the quest for the Holy Grail (*gradalis*) or Greal. These fall outside our limits, though so full of interest. Personally I must confess to a lingering wish that I could believe this story of Joseph of Arimathea which the older British monks may have kept alive for William of Malmesbury, however provokingly incredible, one might almost say foolish, some of the trappings (omitted here) may be.

There remains a very unsubstantial story which is probably the one with which Welshmen are most familiar. I take it from the Triad as found on page 404 of the *Myvyrian Archaeology* (Gee's edition).[1]

William of Malmesbury, and the Graal story, is given in the *Nova Legenda Anglie*, vol. ii, p. 78.

[1] These *Trioedd* or *Triads* form a kind of presentation of historical events in batches of three, where there is some common character attributed to the three persons or events named. They are generally regarded as belonging, in their present form, to three distinct groups.

1. The Triads of The Red Book, Y Llyfr Coch Hergest, printed in Gwenogfryn Evans's *Mabinogion*, pp. 297–309, and a series identical with them by Mr. Egerton Phillimore in *Y Cymmrodor*, vii, pp. 123, 124, from the Hengwrt MSS. 202. We have in these the witness of the fourteenth century.

2. To the second class belong the Triads published by Skene in the appendix to vol. ii of *The Four Ancient Books of Wales*, pp. 456–65. These also must be placed somewhere in the fourteenth century.

3. The third class consists of Triads found on pp. 400–17 of the *Myvyrian Archaeology*. They were copied in 1601 from a MS. known as The Book of Ieuan Brechva, and from another to which the name Book of Caradoc of Llancarvan is given; Ieuan Brechva is said to have died about A. D. 1500, but the 'Book of Caradoc', known as a History, cannot be the real title of the other MS.

If we take the Triads as they appear in the most accessible of the books

I am quoting from the latest group of Triads:—

'Three noted ones among the kings of the Isle of Britain. First Brân the Blessed, son of Llyr Lledïaith, who first brought the faith in Christ to the nation of the Cymry, from Rome, where he was seven years a hostage for his son Caradawc, whom the men of Rome carried captive by the seduction, the deceit and treachery of Aregwedd Foeddawg. Second was Lleirwg ab Coel ab Cyllin Sant (note this name of the grandfather), who is called Lleufer Mawr, who built the first church in Llandâv, and that was the first church in the island of Britain: he granted the privilege of nationality, judgment and oath to every one of the Christian faith. Third Cadwaladr the Blessed . . .'; this we may omit. *Myv. Arch.* p. 404, 35, cf. 402, 18.

Now it is only in the latest class of Triads that Brân appears in this character, a character that is absent in the other two classes. Caradawc is generally identified with Caratacus of Tacitus and Dio Cassius, and Aregwedd, daughter of Avarwy ab Lludd, with Cartismandua. Cynobelinus is lost here. Also Avarwy in other Triads is of the time of Julius Caesar; Lucius in the second part appears as Lleirwg Sant or Lleufer Mawr, names which must be later than the Welsh version of Geoffrey's *Historia*, where, however, his grandfather is not Cyllin. Here we first find Brân, and except in these late Triads we have no other record or mention of him as the first to bring 'the faith in Christ' over to Britain.

We come next to the story of Lucius, three opinions respecting the simple notice of which (found first of all in the *Liber Pontificalis*) should be mentioned here. A British King Lucius sends, such is the story, a letter to the Bishop of Rome, Eleuther (A.D. 174–89), praying that he should be made a Christian through him. Now in the first place, Mr. Bradshaw, in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, p. 15, says that the words 'were manifestly written in the time and tone of Prosper (*c.* 455), with the spirit of whose

named, the *Myvyrian Archæology*, the three classes or families may be ranged thus:—

1. Triads on pp. 301-94, i.e. nos. 46-77, 87, 91, though with some exceptions.

2. Triads on pp. 388-91, nos. 7-46, with a few exceptions.

3. Triads on pp. 400-17.

notices of the missions of Germanus and Palladius in 429 and 431 they precisely tally'. Secondly, Dr. Zimmer, in his *Keltische Kirche*, says: 'It is highly probable that it was invented towards the end of the seventh century by a representative of Rome, in order to support him in his claims against the Britons.'[1] One places it in the fifth, the other in the seventh century. But, in the third place, Harnack has introduced a strikingly different view. Let us, however, delay the statement of it somewhat, because we shall then see its significance better should it turn out to be the true explanation.

The notice referring to Lucius and Eleuther appears in the *Liber Pontificalis*, though not in what is by some conveniently called the first edition, and it has been viewed by many writers with extreme suspicion, and by others as intended to magnify the power and authority of the Bishop of Rome. I am unable to feel that there is in it any indication of such an intention. It reads as follows:—

'Eleuther natione Graecus ex patre Abundio de oppido Nicopoli, sedit ann. xv, m. iii, d. ii. Fuit Temporibus Antonini et Commodi usque ad Paterno et Bradua. Hic accepit epistula a Lucio, Brittannio (*or* Britanio) rege, ut Christianus efficeretur per eius mandatum.'

'Eleuther, a Greek whose father was Abundius of the city of Nicopolis, occupied the bishop's chair fifteen years, three months, and two days. It was in the days of Antoninus (161–80) and Commodus (161–9), extending to the consulship of Paternus and Bradua (A.D. 185 probably). He received a letter from Lucius, king of Britain, asking to be made a Christian by his command.'

The bad grammar is plain, but the forms *Britanio* or *Brittannio* are strange. No consulship of Paternus and Bradua is recorded, but Maternus and Bradua were Consuls in 185.

Although the assertion is so precise, it implies action that was impossible at that time; there could have been no native king in a Roman province, though there might have been a petty chief somewhere in the mountains of Wales, yet such a one would never dream of corresponding with the Bishop of Rome. This is admitted by M. Duchesne, the

[1] *The Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland* (English Trans., David Nutt), p. 2. See also the same writer's *Nennius Vindicatus*, pp. 140 ff., 150 ff.

learned editor of the *Liber Pontificalis*: 'Que le fait soit invraisemblable, cela saute aux yeux', he remarks, and again, 'l'assertion précise, quoique fausse.' But the writer or compiler of the *Lives of the Popes* contained in this work, he adds, betrays no great concern about places distant from Rome, the founding of churches in them, or the relation of their first missionaries to the Roman Church. Consequently, the search for any dogmatic intention, having as object to magnify the power of the Bishop of Rome or to supply a basis of his supremacy over the churches of Britain, seems quite out of place: 'c'est égarer son exégèse,' is M. Duchesne's remark, and it is difficult to disagree with him.[1]

The simple words which gave occasion to so much amplification afterwards in mediaeval historical writings, as also to attempts at finding a motive for their appearance, are seen first of all in this notice of Eleuther, which says that he received a letter from Lucius, king of Britain, asking to be made a Christian by his command. The notice is expanded by Beda in Book i, c. 4, of his *Historia*: 'and at once he obtained the fulfilment of his pious request; the Britons after receiving the faith preserved it inviolate and intact until the times of Diocletian.' Beda, correctly following the *Liber Pontificalis*, places the letter in the times (*tempora*) of Marcus Antoninus Verus (generally known as Marcus Aurelius), and Aurelius Commodus, that is, Lucius Verus, whose death occurred in 169. The date of Eleuther, as given by Funk, is 174–89, so that Beda here repeats the contradiction of the *L. P.*: in his *Chronicle* the conversion of Lucius is placed under the year 180.[2] The English historian, as the almost verbal identity of phrasing in the *Chronicle* shows, had become possessed of a copy of the *Liber Pontificalis*, taking his information direct from that source, or having it procured for him. About the same time, also, a copy of the same work had reached Wales, and was used by the writer of the *Historia Brittonum*, the work that

[1] *Liber Pontificalis*, p. cii: Éleuthère et le Roi Breton Lucius.

[2] 'Lucius Brittaniae rex missa ad Eleuterum Romae episcopum epistola, ut Christianus efficiatur, inpetrat.'

goes under the name of Nennius.[1] The story is thus given by him: 'After 167 years from the birth of Christ, Lucius a British king, along with all the princes of the whole of Britain, received baptism, an embassy having been sent to him from the Emperor of the Romans and from the Roman Pope Eucharistus.' The confusion shown in this early amplification of the original is evident in its mention of the 'princes of Britain', 'Roman Emperor,' and 'Pope Eucharistus'.

I place the words of Beda and of Nennius side by side.

Beda, *H. E.* i. 4.

Anno ab incarnatione Domini CLVI Marcus Antoninus Uerus XIIII ab Augusto regnum cum Aurelio Commodo fratre suscepit; quorum temporibus cum Eleuther uir sanctus pontificatui Romanae ecclesiae praeesset, misit ad eum Lucius Brittaniarum rex epistolam, obsecrans, ut per eius mandatum Christianus efficeretur; et mox effectum piae postulationis consecutus est; susceptamque fidem Brittani usque in tempora Diocletiani principis inuiolatam integramque quieta in pace seruabant. (Plummer's edition, i, p. 16.)

'Marcus Ant. Verus' is commonly called Marcus Aurelius and began to reign in A.D. 161. His colleague, whose name was Lucius Verus, had as adoptive name Lucius Aurelius Antoninus Verus Commodus, which explains the name as given in the text. He, as is said above, died in 169.

Nennius, *Hist. Brittonum*, c. 22.

Post CLXVII annos post aduentum Christi Lucius Britannicus rex cum omnibus regulis totius Brittanicae gentis baptismum suscepit missa legatione ab imperatore Romanorum et a papa Romano Eucharisto.

Five MSS. read Euaristo, others Eleutherio, by emendation. Two add to the name *Lucius* the words: *agnomine Leuer Maur, id est magni splendoris propter fidem, que in eius tempore venit.* There was no Roman bishop of the name Eucharistus, and Euaristus is placed *c.* 99–107. (Mommsen's edition, p. 164.)

'He sent to Rome, to Apostle Eulenchie,' we read in the *Brut* or *The Chronicles of England*, edited for the Early English Text Society by Dr. Brie (1906).

The dates in both extracts are plainly impossible, especially when we have regard to the dates for Eleuther, i. e. A. D. 174–89; Langen gives 175–89. The information conveyed to us in the extract from Nennius is most

[1] On Nennius's date see below.

strangely inaccurate and misleading. It is well known that the Roman Emperor in 167 was Marcus Aurelius, who, ten years later, if not previously, proved himself the most cruel and fiercest persecutor the Christians ever had; the name Eucharistus represents no one, and 167 was previous to the episcopate of Eleuther.

This British account is evidently independent of Beda, and its wild aberrations remind us of Geoffrey of Monmouth: the whole affair is a Roman mission pure and simple, successful of course; every trace of a previous letter or message from Lucius to Eleuther is obliterated.

The further enlargement of this story by British writers of the twelfth century will occupy us further on. A brief mention may be made here that the Book of Llandâv substitutes for the letter sent to the Bishop of Rome (Eleutherius, *sic*) two *legati*, Elvanus and Meduinus, who are ordained to evangelize the people:[1] Geoffrey of Monmouth, in the *Historia Regum Britanniae*, while magnifying the account of the letter to Eleutherius (*sic*), names the *duo religiosissimi doctores* as Faganus and Duvianus,[2] in which he is followed almost verbatim by the author of the *Epitome Historiae Britannicae*.[3]

It has been with reason observed that this whole story is absent from the pages of Gildas (*c.* 540), who, it should be noted, does not seem to know of any one in particular as connected with the introduction of Christianity to Britain; only in very general terms, such as he found in Rufinus's Latin version of Eusebius or in Orosius, and as having taken place at a very early period, does he say that 'upon Britain, as upon the whole world, the sun rose by the resurrection of Jesus Christ'. He even intimates that the spread of the gospel was slow: 'the native population (*incolae*) received it coldly.'[4]

Now let us look at Harnack's conjecture or hypothesis. He puts aside completely all conjectures as to intention in

[1] *Book of Llandâv*, p. 68. [2] *Historia Brit.* iv. 19.

[3] *Cambro-British Saints*, p. 278, from MS. Titus D. xxii (Brit. Mus.).

[4] Gildas, *De Excidio*, c. 9 'Quae licet ab incolis *tepide accepta sunt*, apud quosdam tamen integre minus . . . permansere.'

the added notice inserted some time after 530 in the *Liber Pontificalis*, with respect to the conversion of this British king named Lucius. While all are of one mind that the story must be purely fabulous, the reason of its insertion in the brief account of Eleuther has remained a mystery. Harnack, however, explains it as a transcriptional error, yet in a way that gives the passage an historical value. The king is not a British prince, but Abgar IX of Edessa (known from Dio Cassius), whose full name was Lucius Aelius Septimius Megas Abgarus IX. and the unusual form *Brittanio* (or *Britanio*) is simply *Birtha*, which also designates the city of Edessa: the connexion is explained further by the fact that the apostles Thaddeus and Jude, in an old list of apostles' tombs, are said to have been buried in *Britio Edessenorum*, that is at Edessa; and *Britio* is also known as an old form for Britain.[1] Hence the substitution of a British Lucius for an Edessene Lucius. Dr. Harnack repeats this view in his work on the *Expansion of Christianity* (p. 410, Engl. Trans.).

This story of Lucius, or Lles ap Coel, or Lleirwg, or Lleufer Mawr, as he is called in Welsh, has for us simply the interest of a piece of Hagiography, a tale that was believed and became amazingly popular and widespread during the Middle Ages, lending itself to expansion and elaboration at the hands of Geoffrey of Monmouth and others. But we find that the story is accepted by many as authentic history; even Polydore Vergil, who so staggered and angered our fathers in the time of Henry VII and Henry VIII by ridiculing their Brute, their Brennus, and most of those kingly personages whom Geoffrey had introduced into his pages—even he regards Joseph of Arimathea and Lucius as having taken a real part in the evangelization of Britain. Others, notably some eminent Frenchmen, from time to time have followed along the same path.

Zimmer holds that the Welsh form found in the *Brut* of

[1] *Sitzungsberichte der königlich-preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (1904, pp. 900-16). A full notice of this conjecture appears in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. xxiv, p. 393: on the whole, the view is there accepted.

Geoffrey, i. e. *Lles* for Lucius, is evidence of the lateness of the story. The same work has Dyvric and Padric for Dubricius and Patricius, so that we should expect Luc, Lyc, or Lic. We may probably advance another reason—the fact that the Welsh version of the *Brut* shows some influence of Norman French, in which language there was a very early translation of Geoffrey's *Historia*, may have caused *Lles* to come through *Luce* (where $c = s$).

Whatever may be the judgement of history on Harnack's conjecture, while we are bound to put aside the view expressed in Haddan and Stubbs's *Councils*, with its assertion of a motive for the notice of Lucius in supposed predispositions of the fifth century, as well as Zimmer's view with its suggestion of a different motive in the circumstances of the seventh, we certainly seem justified in concluding that a belief *did* exist as to the very *early* introduction of Christianity to Britain. Even if, with fuller knowledge, the explanation suggested by Harnack be abandoned, we have, at the least, simple and disinterested evidence that from some unknown source there had come to Italy the echo of a belief of this kind. We have this, but no more. We abandon, though regretfully, all the finely woven stories of past ages, to seek afresh, in the intimations of history, some light on the probable ways by which the Christian faith and religion may have first reached our island.

CHAPTER III

THE COMING AND SPREADING OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND CHURCH

We speak of the religion of the Celts, of the Latins, or of the Greeks; but we have to remember that Christianity in contrast with these is more than a religion. In the case of the Celt or Latin we endeavour to find the conceptions that had been arrived at by the one or the other respecting his gods and the particular rites which were observed in the worship paid to these powers. But we observe also that morals had no place in heathen religions as such, though heathen peoples were found possessing elevated ethical ideas. The conceptions that might be held respecting the relation of divine powers to the universe and the world of men, the ideas which underlie morality and the discipline of life, were subjects of study and teaching by philosophers or 'wise men' of differing types; but the priest of religion, as such, was simply the man to whom was formally delegated the performance of certain fixed rites, and, among the Romans, of reciting fixed formulae of prayer or praise. It mattered not what the life of such a priest might be; he was not expected to be better than other people, and, even when his office exacted determining qualifications, a degraded life did not contravene any of them. Christianity, on the other hand, brought to men a knowledge of one God, unique and supreme, and a worship that was, above all, spiritual in character; God stood, by its revelation, in close relation to men as the God of righteousness but also of love and compassion. Being such, the new religion stood opposed to polytheism of every kind, to idolatry whether gross or refined, to bloody sacrifices, and official pomp. But it was also the creator of new affections—feelings of trust and love and reverence; it authoritatively called all men to a strict morality, controlled

and guided by the *ecclesia*, the organized life of an association of believers; it brought, in its sacred books, a doctrine to be apprehended by the intellect, a teaching in which wise and unwise would find a substitute for the common conceptions of the universe and the destiny of man. With all, yet pre-eminent, as something which the Scriptures were intended not so much to give as to record, stood the revelation of Jesus the Son of God, Himself the Revealer; to Him hearts turn in love and adoration as their Redeemer and King.[1] This and more came with Christianity to Britain.

The mind reverts at this point to a work which has been a thousand times quoted, and has been pronounced to be the most striking of Christian pamphlets before the *De Incarnatione* of Athanasius—I mean the *Epistula ad Diognetum*. Its powerful language gives a Christian's vivid conception of what Christians *were bound and found to be* about A.D. 150, in what we may call the heroic period, and the words have never lost their force:—

> For Christians are not distinguished from other men either in land or in speech or in customs. For they neither dwell in cities of their own, neither do they use a different language, neither do they practise an extraordinary way of life. . . . They dwell in their countries, but as sojourners; they take their share of all things as citizens, and endure all things as foreigners. Every foreign country is a fatherland to them, and every fatherland a foreign country. They marry like all other men, and have children, but they do not cast away their offspring. They have their tables in common, but not their wives. In the flesh they are, but do not live after the flesh. Their time is spent on earth, but their citizenship is in heaven. . . . In a word, what the soul is in the body, this Christians are in the world; the soul is spread through all the members of the body, and Christians through the cities of the world. The soul dwells in the body, but is not of the body; so Christians dwell in the world, yet are not of the world. . . . Christians when punished increase the more day by day. To so great a task did God appoint them, and this it is not lawful for them to decline.

[1] One might choose as an instance of the mighty change felt by an earnest Christian, in his abandonment of the heathenism of his time, the description of his experience both as a pagan and as a Christian given by Cyprian in his *Ad Donatum*, of which long passages are translated and quoted in Archbishop Benson's *Cyprian, His Life, His Times, and His Work*.

The Epistle from which this extract is made was written less than half a century before the time we fix approximately for the earliest appearance of Christians in Britain, and the perusal of such words prepares us to form an idea of the new views and the new power which the noblest of them carried hither. Those first benefactors who brought to Britain the faith of Christ are to us 'nameless saints'. But it is the same with other countries to which the religion of the Cross came in very early times. Neither the time nor the manner of its introduction is known. Tertullian expressly states that the Christians of Carthage, of whose vast number and influence he is himself the chief witness, when writing the *Apologeticus* about A. D. 197, owed their *auctoritas* to the Church of Rome. Yet no clue is given as to either manner or date of the earlier coming to Africa. Nor has any writer given definite information as to how or when churches were formed among Greeks and Copts at Alexandria and in higher Egypt. When, in 177, 'the servants of Christ dwelling in Vienne and Lugdunum' in Gaul write an account of the martyrdoms there 'to the brethren throughout Asia and Phrygia who hold the same faith and hope of redemption', the narrative gives an impression of the greatness both of the number and the influence of the Christians; yet no one knows anything of whence or how the faith came to those parts.[1] Irenaeus, who succeeded the martyred Pothinus as their bishop soon after 177, declares that he ministered as such to Celtic Christians in the same region.[2] Yet again, no one can tell us how these had become Christianized.

By unknown ways Christianity, carrying in itself the *ecclesia*, spread to such parts with no appointed missionary or preacher, but by the simple stirrings of multitudes of souls not only to be Christians themselves, but to make others also Christians. They felt themselves to be debtors unto all men, whether Greeks or barbarians, bond or free, and so they multiplied, as it were, of themselves. We cannot but mark the

[1] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* v. i.

[2] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haereses*, Proeem. 3, i. 10, 2.

new spirit quite as much as the new ideas and hope brought by Christianity into the world.

> I see the error; but above
> The scope of error, see the love—
> Oh, love of those first Christian days!
> —Fanned so soon into a blaze,
> From the spark preserved by the trampled sect.
> (Browning, 'Christmas-Eve.')

Correctness and nobleness of life had been found, and would appear again, among many intelligent heathen; yet the simple Christian converts were conscious not only of new ideas, or of a better philosophy, as Justin Martyr was wont to say, but also of a high calling, of mightier hopes, while at the same time they were unconsciously clothed with a character that proved stronger than intellect. That epistle from Gaul after the terrible trial of persecutions throws light upon men of this type. One of these was Alexander from Phrygia, a physician by profession, who 'had spent many years in Gaul, and was known almost to all men for his love of God and boldness of speech; for he was a man endowed with the apostolic gift'. The inscriptions tell us of professional men in Britain,[1] men of special professional training. With them, from the second century especially, there were rhetoricians and grammarians in the schools which the towns or municipalities supported all over the Western empire. Britain was far more in the line of diffusion than such a country as Spain, which, though a kind of inner island, also possessed these institutions. The inscriptions tell us of architects, skilled artisans, workers in gold, silver, lead and stone. Britain soon became the granary for the legions on the Rhine, and the interchange of commodities created centres and lines of trade. We infer that Christianity must have been introduced and diffused by men who travelled hither and thither and settled in pursuit of these avocations, which were created by the growing Roman

[1] *C. I. L.* vii, p. 48; *Catalogue of Grosvenor Museum, Chester*, No. 10, p. 21: an altar set up with an inscription in Greek by 'Hermogenes a physician'. The *Corpus* also, 1308-21, describes seals of 'eye physicians'.

civilization. Being Christians they carried their Christianity with them, becoming missionaries of the faith while engaged in their various callings they were *doctores ecclesiae.* The organized life of a community would not be long in forming itself, as we see it had formed itself in the neighbourhood of Vienne and Lugdunum as early as A. D. 177. The Christian life implies the community life, for which a church would provide the effective power and symbol of its unity to the best profit of each individual believer. As a revealed religion, also, Christianity, carrying in itself the need of a community, would require some form of ministry in order to realize its own purposes. Long before we can think of Christians in Britain, the sub-apostolic age had been busy and successful in organizing such a life of the Church, summing up in short permanent forms the teaching committed to it, arriving, on the whole, at a general understanding as to the canonical books of Scripture.[1] The salutary purging of itself that resulted from the conflict with and victory over Gnosticism, the fixed organization that arose the stronger out of the struggle against Montanism, though that movement contained no small amount of good—all this had taken, or was taking everywhere, lasting definite directions of growth before the coming of Christianity into Britain. It is quite outside my limits to speak of the intimations of Scripture itself, or even of tradition, as to any organized form of the Christian Church. Without considering the question of what it *ought* to be, I take it as history makes it known to us before the second half of the second century. Accordingly, it may be held that the new religion was carried over by men who came to live in Britain from other countries, civic officials, professional men, craftsmen or tradesmen, rich and poor. These, however, brought it as they had learnt it, with the canonical books of Scripture well recognized (except, it may be, with differences of opinion as to three or four short epistles), with their concise baptismal creed as a summary of doctrine. As churches were formed,

[1] On this point, as showing the *feeling* of churches, instructive first-hand guidance will be found in Eusebius, *H. E.* iii. 3 and 15; also vi. 13, 14, and 25.

they elected for each community a pastor whom they called, as others did, the *episcopus* (bishop, escop). The *episcopus* in each church, whenever the number of immigrant believers and converts allowed, would be aided by others of lower rank named presbyteri and diaconi. Such a form of church life had already become universal: the why or how stands outside our purpose.

The earliest churches were, no doubt, formed among the Roman provincials, though we have no reason to doubt that Celtic-speaking Britons also *in time* became converts and attached themselves to such churches. There can be no reason, we further add, for excluding the preaching and propaganda of pastors or presbyters and others spoken of as teachers (*doctores*). When we look round at the old heathen religions we find them to be all more or less connected with the political constitution or the social state of peoples, preserving even in their beliefs a certain national, and frequently municipal, physiognomy, and confining themselves within the boundaries of a single territory beyond which they seldom emerged. Consequently there had been, as De Tocqueville remarks, no great religious revolutions in the West before the coming of Christianity; this passed over all the barriers which had arrested the progress of the heathen religions.[1] Briton and Roman might be found side by side, as they were nowhere else united, in 'the Courts of the Temple of Christ'.[2]

We may now turn to consider the probable time of the coming of Christianity to Britain. I am led, on this question, to differ from some strong assertions made by certain great authorities, but I do so with unfeigned appreciation of all that they have taught us. It is well known that the first allusion to the existence of Christianity in Britain is found in the *Adversus Iudaeos*, c. 7, of Tertullian. Of this Harnack says: 'Tertullian's notice (in *Adv. Iud.* c. 7) is of no consequence' (*Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, p. 512; Engl. Tr., p. 410). 'The rhetorical tenor of these passages forbids

[1] *L'Ancien Régime et la Révolution*, p. 16. He compares the progress of the French Revolution to the propaganda of a new religion.

[2] The phrase is Döllinger's (English Trans.).

our treating them as safe testimonies,' says Zimmer in his lengthy article, 'Keltische Kirche' (*Realencyklopädie für protest. Theol. und Kirche*, x; Engl. Tr., p. 3). I am led to treat the passage differently, there being good grounds, as I feel, for so doing. The rhetorical exaggeration of Tertullian here, while it does not stand alone, will also supply its own correction. But, maybe, the view advanced in these pages is not quite what Harnack and Zimmer condemn, for Dr. Harnack allows 'that it is quite possible that Christians had arrived in Britain by the end of the second century'. My contention goes a little further, and I hold that the passage from Tertullian conveys a real echo, and so far evidence, of this as a fact known at the time of his writing. We do not read the passage by itself, we recall also statements of a similar kind made by Origen and Hippolytus, besides views expressed in more general terms respecting the spread of Christianity in the world by a variety of writers.[1]

Tertullian apparently speaks as one who intimates *in the case of Britain, but of no other country*, something of which he had undoubted information as a fact of his own time, *the intimation being coupled with his further knowledge that the faith of Christ was then in harassed Britain.* This first of Latin writers, we may remind ourselves, was a citizen of Carthage, the second city of the empire, the son of a centurion, who before his conversion had practised as a lawyer both at Rome and at Carthage.[2] His education, his intellectual grasp and his acquaintance with the history of the past, the rush of his powerful mode of expression, the forensic manner of speech in argument, are fully described in books dealing specially with Christian literature. When one is fairly well acquainted with the writings of this man, the impression is deepened that a mere sentence, or at times a single word in them, has a significance not to be passed over lightly. 'His very words, almost, are sentences,' so said Vincent of Lerins in the fifth century ('quot paene

[1] See Harnack's *Ausbreitung*, Book IV, ch. i; Engl. Tr., p. 148 ff.

[2] On the close relation between Rome and Carthage much is said in the early pages of Archbishop Benson's work on Cyprian.

verba, tot sententiae sunt'). What Tertullian says is as follows: 'In whom else have all the nations believed than in the Christ who has already come?' (His argument is directed against the Jews, and Acts ii. 9 is quoted.) 'Parthians and other nations, such as different races of the Gaetuli, many borders of the Mauri, all the confines of Spain and various tribes of Gaul, also *places in Britain which, though inaccessible to the Romans, have yielded to Christ*; also districts among the Sarmatae, the Daci, the Germans, the Scythians, and many remote peoples, provinces, and islands unknown to us which we are unable to reckon.' It was not unnatural that Tertullian should, in his advocate's style, name the series of peoples mentioned by the wondering strangers at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, as having believed in 'the Christ who has already come'; it was also natural that he should name far-off nations of his own day. If we put together three passages of his contemporary, Origen, we find almost the same names; there is a similar enumeration by another contemporary, Hippolytus, in the *Philosophumena* (x. 34). A host of quotations might be collected, as has been said already, which, without names of countries, are significant of the same fact and evidence of a deep-seated conviction in the minds not only of Christians but also of heathen, such as Porphyry and afterwards Maximin Daza, the persecutor, that the religion of Jesus was spreading to every land. There might be, at times, exaggeration, but many must have shared the qualifying thought—salutary for Christians of to-day—beautifully expressed by the Christian speaker in the dialogue of Minucius Felix (another contemporary of Tertullian's): 'Let us not flatter ourselves at our number; we appear many to ourselves, yet in God's eyes we are very few.'[1] But, as we look again at Tertullian's list of peoples among whom Christians were to be found, we observe *that the only nation respecting which a detail of contemporary historical fact is added, is that of the Britanni*; it is mentioned as something well known that the Romans have not

[1] 'Nec nobis de nostra frequentia blandiamur: multi nobis videmur, sed Deo admodum pauci sumus,' *Octavius*, c. 33.

succeeded in reaching certain places in the island. No such comment is attached to any one of the other names: with respect to Britain alone, a prominent fact is singled out. It is probable that Tertullian was a jurist at Rome when the Wall of Antonine was broken through, and serious troubles followed in 183 or 184, though Ulpius Marcellus was finally victor. He was certainly, as the *Apologeticus* (A.D. 197) shows, well acquainted with the fate of Clodius Albinus, who in Britain claimed and got the imperial title, and crossed over to Gaul to fall in the great battle in which he was defeated by Septimus Severus near Lyon in 197: he must also have known how the attenuated army in Britain under the Legate Virius Lupus suffered at the hands of the Maeatae and Caledonii in the same year. Until the time when the *Adversus Iudaeos* was written, there was confusion and warfare in Britain; owing to this very fact Tertullian relates as being an affair talked of in Rome and Carthage that there were in the island 'inaccessa Romanis loca'. In 208 Severus departed for Britain, ending his campaign, after severe fighting and cession of territory, by abandoning the more northern wall and strengthening the older southern Vallum of Hadrian. One gathers that Britain in those days was fairly well known to enlightened men at an important centre such as Carthage: it was thus well known to Tertullian, and whatever adverse impression may be produced in our minds by an allusion to 'rhetorical strain' passes away after closer scrutiny. May we not naturally conclude that when, in this matter-of-fact allusion, he also makes mention of believers in Britain, his words are to be accepted as very trustworthy evidence?[1] There are some who are not led away by such terms as 'rhetoric' or 'rhetori-

[1] Date of *Adv. Iudaeos*. The fullest account of the probable dates of the various writings of Tertullian may be found in Nöldechen, 'Die Abfassungszeit der Schriften Tertullians,' *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, V. 2; in Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*; in Harnack's *Geschichte der altchr. Litt.* The two latter decide for a later date of the *Adv. Iudaeos*, based chiefly upon its relation to *Adv. Marcion.* iii. cc. 9–14. It falls, Monceaux concludes, in Tertullian's second period, A.D. 200–6.

cal'. Schultze, in the second part of his *History of the Fall of Graeco-Roman Heathenism*, after describing the unfavourable circumstances with which the Christian communities had to contend in Britain, proceeds as follows: 'The celebrated reference in Tertullian to Christians in Britain is hardly mere rhetoric (ist schwerlich blosse Rhetorik): there could not fail to be some Christians in the island, in the second century, any less than elsewhere with the advance of the Roman conquest. In a garrison of 30,000 men, with a large number of officers, and in the certainly considerable number of persons who with this or that motive betook themselves to Britain, there were, as a matter of course, Christians to be found.'[1] These are words of weight, spoken by an author who is pre-eminently objective, if one may use the term, in all his treatment of the movements and changes due to Christianity before, and during, the fourth and fifth centuries.

The notice of Britain in the passage referred to, being so unique and descriptive as compared with the bare mention of every one of the other places or peoples named, and tallying as it does with the events of the time as regards the fortunes of Roman troops in Britain, leads us to infer that Tertullian knew, about A.D. 200–206, of 'a submission to Christ' there. Our inference goes thus far, but cannot extend further.

We may fix upon an approximate date some time between A.D. 180 and 200. It was about 180 that the Roman empire began to realize the true bearing of events, how a new religion was fast spreading within its borders east and west, a religion unlike any other known, appealing with surprising power to the reason and heart of many. Its presence was felt as a well-organized society, and many were tempted to call the Christians 'the third nation'[2], which by writings, by letters, by messengers, was forming and spreading an intercommunion of wonderful meaning,

[1] *Geschichte des Untergangs des griechisch-römischen Heidentums*, ii, p. 120.

[2] The term appears for the first time in the *Apology* of Aristides (about 140).

compass and intensity. Marcus Aurelius died in 180: at that time Irenaeus was bishop of Lyon in Gaul, having also some undefined pastoral relation to other churches, since Eusebius (*H. E.* v. 23) mentions a letter of 'the churches in Gaul of which Irenaeus had oversight' (*τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν δὲ παροικιῶν, ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει*). We have good evidence that Carthage, Scillium and Mauretania in North Africa had Christian communities at an equally early date, i. e. before A. D. 180 (Passio Sanctorum Scilitanorum; Gebhardt, *Ausgewählte Märtyreracten*, p. 22). Such also were found in Spain and Germany, as Irenaeus is witness. We are led with no small confidence to complete this chain of reasoning with the addition that Britain also, by about A. D. 180–200, had seen Christians and Christian congregations.

CHAPTER IV

A BRITISH CHURCH OF A.D. 200

When we adopt a date, such as A.D. 200, we do so simply as a help in fixing our minds upon a particular period, though the period may begin somewhat earlier or, maybe, somewhat later than the selected date. It would be entirely futile and misleading to make any further use than this of the year so fixed upon. In order to obtain information about any characteristic features of the Christian Church in Britain about A.D. 200, recourse must be had to continental writers, upon the fair presumption that the Church here, being at its beginning a Church of immigrants, would in its life resemble other Churches of the same period. Hence we turn to study the history of other communities which had begun as immigrant Churches, such as those of Gaul or North Africa, or even Italy.

The grave bareness of contribution from native sources is made evident by the fact that we know of no name, except St. Alban, no name of a bishop, until we come to the three who travelled from York, Lincoln, and London to the Council of Arles in 314; after that no further name appears till that of Pelagius (a layman), Palladius, and St. Patrick, nor of any bishop until that of Riocatus, about 462 or even 473. After 500 the whole scene changes, and our eyes behold well-known men in multitudes.

Sometimes one finds that error arises because British monachism is confusedly connected with early Christianity. We may, therefore, be pardoned by those who know better for stating here that no monk or monastery was seen in Britain before the fifth century had advanced near the thirties, that is, some time during 420–430. The hypothesis that British Christianity had an Eastern origin, being connected, through the Churches around Lyon in Gaul, with the

Church of Ephesus, and so bringing an 'Ephesine liturgy' to Britain, was once widely prevalent. The theory long maintained its hold on, if it was not introduced by Protestant continental and English writers, because it enabled them to represent the Church in Britain as apostolic without being Roman. But it is now condemned, as well as the 'Ephesine liturgy', on almost all sides; see, for instance, Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils* (vol. i, p. xix). Yet even there we find it stated that Christianity 'found its way to Britain through (most probably) Lyon, and not through the then equally Greek Church of Rome'. It is difficult to find any valid reason for the definite exclusion of Rome. Even the author of that valuable book, *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, while he brings forward 'facts which go far to save such a theory from the charge of being utterly groundless', hardly seems himself to believe in it[1]. The facts he brings forward seem to be late, belonging to a time when monachism and pilgrimages had brought Eastern ideas and Eastern modes of expression into Britain and Ireland no less than to other places.

Dr. Zimmer expresses the opinion that Christianity came here 'from Gaul and the Lower Rhine in the first place'; yet a difficulty meets him in the striking conclusions which Duchesne has drawn in pp. 30–3 of his *Fastes épiscopaux*, vol. i, as to 'la fondation tardive de la plupart de nos églises'. There is no evidence except of one church in Gaul—that of Lyon—in the second century, and in the third century only of Toulouse, Vienne, Trèves, and Reims. Christians may, however, have been numerous along the coast, *without bishops*, the lists of whom he takes as his guiding principle, and this fact he seems to allow in his treatment of Eusebius's remark, quoted above, about numerous churches in Gaul (or along Gaul) 'of which Irenaeus had over-sight'. There were churches, many of which, no doubt, had no pastor of their own, being probably too small. Thus, from Gaul, and from the Rhine provinces,

[1] Warren, *The Liturgy and Ritual*, &c., pp. 46-57: 'utterly groundless' is Mr. Haddan's phrase in *The Remains*.

but also from many other places, as the inscriptions show, Christians *might* have come to our island because of its being a Roman province, to which Romanized peoples of every sort and condition were attracted. I have not mentioned the army, as it is difficult to decide how far Christians might be found among the legions and their auxiliaries. The fact that Tertullian alludes to the story of the 'Thundering Legion', and believes it, proves at least that a legion consisting chiefly, if not wholly, of Christians was to him a possibility. His work on *The Soldier's Crown* presupposes Christian soldiers. The *Canons of Hippolytus*, which may be, in their matter, considerably older than the date implied in the name (about 217), expressly allow church-membership of Christians who became soldiers under compulsion (Achelis, in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vi). Numerous *Acta* of martyrs are *Acta* of soldiers. The Court and the army, it has been said, were Christianizing centres. In this case, the number of possible places from which Christians might have come to Britain will be largely augmented, so as to include many Christianized countries from which the Roman legions and auxiliaries were recruited.

Whether we place the coming of the new religion about A.D. 200, a generation earlier or a generation later, we are able to give some account of those who in their immigration carried it hither. Their names are unknown, and the countries they came from can only be a matter of conjecture. Yet the early diffusion of Christianity among men who used the Latin tongue in the exercise of the faith of Christ is to no small number of people a clear and recognized fact. Greek may have prevailed in Rome and along the Mediterranean as the Church's peculiar language. It was used as their native language by several writers, such as Clement and Justin Martyr at Rome and Irenaeus at Lyon in Gaul; yet Latin must have been long in use before the appearance of the authors who are spoken of as the first Christian writers in that tongue. Latin Christian literature generally is regarded as beginning with the writings of Tertullian, and Roman in particular with Novatian, yet the Christian faith must have found in Latin a vehicle

suitable for the expression of its own ideas many years before the end of the second century. It is not easy to believe that 'when Tertullian began to write, Theological Latin had to be formed', or that it stands in him 'like the masses of a fresh-opened quarry'. The terms which afterwards became permanent, chiefly through Tertullian, must have been selected and shaped at an earlier period; the impression is strong in reading him, that he was using expressions which, for the most part, had been prepared for him by earlier Latin immigrants to Africa. It has been suggested, with no small show of reason, that a Latin version of the Scriptures underlies even the Greek of the Letter of the Churches of Lugdunum and Vienne (*c.* A.D. 177).[1] Jerome names Bishop Victor (189–99) and the Senator Apollonius (*c.* 180) as writers in Latin before Tertullian.[2] If the hypothesis that the pseudo-Cyprianic tractate *De Aleatoribus* was written by Victor, the Bishop of Rome, be accepted as correct, we have still further proof that the Latin tongue as a vehicle of thought had been Christianized early in the second century. The terminology of such a book as the *De Aleatoribus* could not be original. Our statements, as made here, though brief, suffice for their single object, that is, to show that those unknown men who carried the knowledge of Christ into the midst of the Roman and Romanized life of Britain came with a language which the pen of many writers had already made a suitable instrument for Christian thought and intercourse. They came therefore with a literature which was Christian. Foremost, these immigrants, imbued some more, some less, with ecclesiastical traditions, brought also into our island copies of the Latin Bible. This was the Old Latin version based, in the Old Testament, on a text older than Origen's *Hexapla*, but in style altogether crude and literal in the extreme. Of slow, popular growth, it bore traces of the language as spoken by the people, and in spite of this defect, perhaps even because of it, continued to hold its place for Gaul and Britain in

[1] *Texts and Studies*, i. 2.

[2] Jerome, *De Vir. Ill.* 53 'Tertullianus presbyter nunc demum primus post Victorem et Apollonium Latinorum ponitur.'

a form less altered than elsewhere, until the first half of the sixth century.[1] It remained and was actually the Bible in which Gildas and St. David were instructed. The earliest churches in Britain, we may repeat, had for their public or private use some form of that rude people's Bible.[2]

Along with the Scriptures in Latin the newcomers carried to their new home that short summary of doctrine which they called their *symbolum* and which we in English speak of as Creed, in Welsh as *Credo*. This probably was the old Roman symbol (unless they used the still older form of it), which for centuries has gone under an apocryphal name as 'The Apostles' Creed'. It seems to be found everywhere after A. D. 200, though not without variations, which, about 400, were still in process of supplementing and modifying the older material until it took the form now called the Received Text.[3]

[1] The age of the Old Latin version is variously stated: notwithstanding the minute and extensive inquiries of our own days, long after the monumental work of Sabatier, a cloud of darkness still hangs over its origin. Proconsular Africa, Italy, and Western Gaul have had their share in its production and elaboration; 'the African was the parent of the European text, having undergone revision when it travelled northwards, and been in some measure adapted to the needs of a more highly cultivated population' (Hort, in *N. Test.*, vol. ii, p. 78). Scrivener's *Introduction; Old Latin Biblical Texts*, vols. i-iii; Nestle, in Herzog, *Realencyclopädie, Bibelübersetzung*; Monceaux, *Hist. litt. de l'Afrique chrétienne*, i. 113. Harnack (*Die Chronologie der altchr. Litteratur*, ii. 296-301) concludes that Tertullian's quotations are made from a version in public use. Hort places it soon after A. D. 150.

[2] Two articles in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Oct. 1905 and Jan. 1906, on the Corbey MS. of the Gospels, contain much that is applicable to the case of Britain. Partially an answer is supplied to the question whether the Old Latin texts of the Scriptures used in Britain came originally from Gaul. It is also curious to observe that the originals of Old French, probably also of British forms of words are found in Old Latin MSS. of the New Testament. Vol. iv of the same Journal contains interesting articles on the Old Latin texts of the Minor Prophets; they would have been more complete had they included Gildas's long quotations.

[3] The study of this ancient Creed has, of late, aroused keen interest. The most thorough investigation is, probably, that by Caspari (*Quellen*, vol. iii), where a very early date is assigned to it. Harnack and

Evidence for its existence in a reconstructed form, about A.D. 70–120, is advanced by Zahn; it is found at Ephesus, he says, in 130, at Rome in 145, and again between 180 and 210 at Lyon, Carthage, and Smyrna. We are vividly reminded of several clauses when we read Ignatius, Irenaeus, and Tertullian. In Warren's *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church* a full account is given of the Creed as used a long time after at Bangor in Ireland. The *Antiphonary of Bangor* has now been published by the H. Bradshaw Society in facsimile and edited by Mr. Warren. I subjoin the earliest known form of this symbol, along with the form which is given in the *Antiphonary*, as illustrating two stages in its history. The first was approximately that probably employed in the earlier period of Christianity in Britain for catechetical instruction and baptism; the second illustrates the peculiar changes that it underwent for Britain as well as Ireland.

(1) I believe in God Almighty: and in Christ Jesus His Son only begotten, our Lord, Who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, Who was crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried, and on the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of the Father, whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead: and in the Holy Ghost, holy Church, remission of sins, resurrection of the flesh, life eternal.—Hahn's *Bibliothek*, p. 22.

(2) I believe in God the Father Almighty, invisible, Maker of all creatures visible and invisible. I believe in Jesus Christ His only Son, our Lord, God Almighty, conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the

Kattenbusch oppose Caspari's position in different ways; the twenty-seventh edition of the former's popular pamphlet (*Das apostolische Glaubensbekentniss*) appeared in 1894. Kattenbusch has written an elaborate and extensive investigation in two volumes (*Das apostolische Symbol*, Band I, 1894, II. i, 1897); the Creed, he believes, was drawn up at Rome about A.D. 100. Dr. Swete, in opposition to some wild statements of Harnack, has published a most careful treatise, *The Apostles' Creed, its relation to Primitive Christianity*. Zahn's little volume on 'The Articles of the Apostles' Creed' has been translated into English by Dr. Burn, whose *Introduction to the Creeds* is especially valuable. We have also Dr. Sanday's article in vol. i of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, entitled 'Recent Research on the Origin of the Creed', and *Facsimiles of the Creeds*, pp. 1–12, by Dr. Burn (H. Bradshaw Society, 1909).

Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, Who was crucified and half descended into Hades, on the third day rose again from the dead the ascended into heaven, sat at the right hand of God the Father Almighty, whence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost, God Almighty, having one essence with the Father and the Son. That there is a holy Catholic Church, remission of sins, communion of saints, resurrection of the flesh.

I believe there is life after death, and life eternal in the glory of Christ. All this I believe in God. Amen.—*The Antiphonary of Bangor*, vol. ii, p. 21.

Credo repeated three times, expressing belief in each Person of the Trinity separately, is also found in the *Sacramentarium Gallicanum*, which Mr. Warren prints on p. 62. But the last paragraph is unique (yet compare Hahn, p. 355, where *et vitam post mortem* is found); so also is the clause: '(I believe) *that there is* a holy Catholic Church,' though it corresponds even in this, and in the absence of *in*, to the Creed as now restored in the Treatise of Nicetas of Remesiana (*c.* 400).

We notice, without taking minute points, the absence of the phrases: *Creator, descended into Hades, the Father Almighty, Catholic, the communion of saints* in the earlier form, several of which were not added until the fifth century. In Britain, it is curious to find that, probably, *communion of saints* was expressed as *sanctorum congregatio*, the very word used by Nicetas in the *Explanatio Symboli*, so that 'communion of saints' meant the 'assembly or congregation of saints'. See also Hahn, comparing p. 80 with p. 355: *catholicam ecclesiam et communionem omnium sanctorum, id est, congregationem omnium fidelium in Christo.*[1]

Viewed historically, the faith of Christ aims at the fullest realization of itself in an institution, which is called the *ecclesia*—in the British tongue *ecclês*, *eclês*, *eglwys*—and, therefore, when the faith came to Britain the Church came with it. In the contemporary account of the martyrdoms at Vienne and Lyon about 177 we have clear evidence of this. Vettius Epagathius, a young man, but distinguished as 'filled with love for God and his neighbour . . . untiring in

[1] See Gildas, *De Exc.* c. 110, Cymmrodorion edition, where we have, I believe, proof of this.

Evidervice for his neighbour', is described as 'one of the A.D. hren'. The charges made against them prove that they had their Eucharist and meetings: Sanctus, who particularly drew upon himself the wrath of the infuriated mob, was 'the deacon from Vienne'; 'the blessed Pothinus who had been entrusted with the ministry of the episcopate in Lyon,' a man of more than ninety years, was one of the sufferers; Attalus, a person of distinction, had 'genuinely practised the Christian discipline'; when all was over, a new bishop in the person of Irenaeus, who in his youth had been intimate with Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, at Ephesus, steps into the place of the martyred pastor. These are facts in the life of the Church along the valley of the Rhone, whence Christians were likely to come to Britain.

It was the same in North Africa when Tertullian was converted to Christianity. His writings indicate to us a Church rich in doctrine, strong in discipline and order, and deeply conscious of unity; we gain the same impression from the *Acta* of the Scillitan martyrs, which carries us back to A.D. 180. The *De Praescriptione*, though in its main argument 'the most plausible and most mischievous book', as Dr. Hort says, nevertheless shows that the doctrine, for the purity of which he strove, is the doctrine of a Church as fully as the doctrine of the individual. A Church is Apostolic, he says, if it has this doctrine,[1] which is its rule of faith, its orders and ordinances fixed, not changing day by day as among the heretics—*episcopus*, *presbyter*, *diaconus*; *lector*, *sacerdotalia munera*, *fidelis*, *catechumenus* are found in Tertullian.[2] 'Where there are three,' he says, 'though they be laics, that is a Church,' but there stands a difference between 'order' and 'people'—*inter ordinem et plebem*—constituted by the authority of the Church.[3] The name and idea of *ordo* comes originally from the State, the clergy being an *ordo* as bearing a name corresponding to

[1] 'In eadem fide conspirantes, non minus apostolicae deputantur pro consanguinitate doctrinae,' c. 32.

[2] c. 41.

[3] *De Exhort. Cast.* 7 'Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici.'

the regular name for the Senate, and to that of the Decurions, in the towns of the provinces and Italy.

From the record of facts and indirect allusions in literature of an earlier date than A.D. 200, it must be inferred that every Church would be jealous to be regarded as 'catholic.' This would then mean, universal; but would also imply something more than universal. What that something was, it is not easy to state.

An individual church, sometimes called *parochia*, sometimes *dioecesis*, though generally *ecclesia*, has, we find, outgrown the initiatory stage described in the Apostolic writings, as it was intended to do, though preserving the principles enunciated there. It had, by this time, differentiated the functions of its ministry, electing one bishop, several presbyters, several deacons, who had severally a position apart—an *ordo*—as compared with the remainder of its members, and special functions. The latter are called 'the people', in Greek ὁ λαός, in Latin *plebs*, *plebeiei*, from which (i.e. from *plebem*) at a very early period came the British *plwyf* in its old sense of *the people* or *congregation*; the whole community is the 'Catholic Church' residing at such and such a place.

Suppose a British Christian congregation to meet in the house of a rich Romanò-Briton about A.D. 200, say at the spacious Roman house discovered at Regni near Chichester, or in an *ecclesia* at London, or in the *municipium* of Verulamium, or in the more important *colonia* of Colchester (Camulodunum), the language used in the service would be Latin, the Scriptures read would be the Old Latin version. The congregation is something more than an aggregate of individuals, it is, to borrow Tertullian's words, a *corpus*, an organized body, so formed 'by common religious feeling, by unity of discipline, and by the covenant of hope.'[1] The congregation 'beset God by common prayer, a kind of violence that is pleasing unto Him': there is reading of 'the divine writings' and sermons; 'with the holy words,' he says,

[1] *Apolog.* 39 'Corpus sumus de conscientia religionis et disciplinae unitate et spei foedere.'

Evidurish our faith, elevate our hope, confirm our trust,
A.D. no less render close our discipline.' Other descriptions might be quoted; this suffices, because these Churches are everywhere of the same type. But look at such a congregation—a living being, as so pointedly suggested by the quotations above, the symbol and agent of high spiritual purposes including prayer, worship, edification, strict discipline carried on *magno cum pondere*, extensive deeds of charity—and one is at once prepared to inquire into the offices or ministries it possessed for the realizing of its ideal. On all sides, with heretics as well as orthodox, we find but one kind of ministry. I wish to stand entirely aside from all matters of controversy at this point, such as the consideration of what *ought* to be the ministry of the Church, whether from the standpoint of Scripture, or of tradition, or of the two combined. Whether our facts do tell one way or another upon questions in dispute, is another point, one which must be determined by itself. Further, I do not touch any such question by stating that the so-called 'diocesan' bishop is not as yet existent at the time we treat of. Two facts will become plain, I believe, as we advance: *first*, that only after the lapse of many centuries was the 'diocese' in our modern sense of the term evolved in the British communion; *second*, that with regard to the metropolitan system, wherein one bishop holds a position of superiority over other bishops, no trace whatever of its existence in the Church of Britain proper appears in the records.

Besides the teaching, for the purposes of which the Church, as well as every individual within it, was regarded as a unit, the Church had also its mode of preparing and admitting converts to share in its communion (*communio* or *communicatio*). This was so universal a practice that it is impossible to think of a Christian Church in which the convert did not appear first as a catechumen during a period of probation, and of special instruction, the length of which was not definitely fixed. Tertullian is the earliest Latin writer —first of all Christian writers so far known—to use the word *catechumenus*, a Greek word with Latin form, in its secondary and limited technical meaning. The term is also

found in the *Canons of Hippolytus* and in the revision of the same, called the Egyptian Church Order, but their date is uncertain. The person who was preparing for baptism or was being prepared privately by Christian brethren, who as *sponsores* would present him to the Church, bore this name of *catechumenus*, but after his baptism would be called, as all the other members of the community, *fidelis*, believer.

No one could become a corporate member of a Church except by baptism. In all early references to the rite, the form or mode of baptizing is rather implied than commanded; but that baptism, the religious ceremony in particular, the rite of initiation into the Christian society, was regarded as of grave significance, both in what it symbolized and what it conferred, there can hardly be any doubt. It was termed by the Greeks σφραγίς, seal, φωτισμός, illumination, ἀναγέννησις, new birth, μυστήριον, mystery, and the corresponding terms *signum*, *illuminatio*, *renatio*, *mysterium*, or, in the same sense, *sacramentum*, appear among the Latins. It was the last act of initiation, effected by immersion in the water and emergence out of it, a solemnly visible act, performed always by the bishop unless he deputed another for the service. The expression used by Augustine in his conference with the British bishops, where he spoke of baptism as 'the service by which we are regenerated unto God', may be found in the Church as early as the *Apologia* of Justin Martyr. It must have been long familiar to the Britons.

It may be instructive to notice some examples of the '*Interrogations*' addressed to the person to be baptized. I take one from Heurtley's *Harmonia Symbolica*, p. 106, and another from the *Canons of Hippolytus* as printed by Achelis, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. vi, 4. (1891).

The former is an account of the baptism of a certain Palmatius about the year 220:

> Dost thou believe with thine whole heart in God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible?
> Palmatius answers: I believe (*Credo*).
> And in Jesus Christ His Son?

And he says: I believe.

Who was born, of the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary?

Palmatius answers: I believe.

And in the Holy Spirit, the holy Catholic Church, the remission of sins and the resurrection of the flesh?

And Palmatius exclaimed with tears, saying: I believe, Lord.

It has been found difficult to fix a date for the Canons of Hippolytus, as they bear evident traces of later modifications and additions. They are generally taken as belonging to the third century, though many questions remain unsolved; like other collections on Church Order, they necessarily contain fragments of greater antiquity than themselves.

Interrogation: Believest thou in God the Father Almighty?

Answer: I believe.

Interr.: Believest thou in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, whom the Virgin Mary bore of the Holy Ghost (Who came to save the human race), who was crucified (for us) under Pontius Pilate, who died and rose again from the dead on the third day, and ascended to heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father, and shall come to judge the quick and the dead?

Ans.: I believe.

Interrr.: Believest thou in the Holy Ghost (*παράκλητον*), proceeding from the Father and the Son?

Ans.: I believe.

The eleventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians places before us the Apostolic view of the Lord's Supper (*κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*) as seen in the life of a Church in danger of being found unfit to partake of it. The Corinthians are taught that the Lord's Supper is a communion of the Lord's body and blood (ch. x), a commemoration of Him, and a proclaiming of His death (ch. xi). Another name for the rite seems almost to be used technically in the passage where it is said to be a *κοινωνία* (participation or communion)—'the cup of blessing (*εὐλογία*) which we bless'—and though we could not quite regard *εὐλογία* as a name, its equivalent, *Eucharist* *εὐχαριστία*, is soon found fixed as denoting this rite in the newer sense, as read in the *Didache*[1] (A. D. 80–120, so Zahn). In Justin Martyr, how-

[1] For the *Didache* I have given the approximate date assigned to it by Zahn. Justin Martyr's *Apologia* may be fairly fixed about A. D. 150.

ever, it is clearly said: 'This food (that over which thanks have been given) is among us called Eucharist.'[1] The name became universal and occurs constantly.

When one reads page after page of Tertullian, and not simply selected phrases or passages, however justly and advantageously selected, in order to find the trend of Tertullian's views, one must feel that a surprising amplitude of doctrinal meaning swells forth in his writings. One is quite conscious of this, and, although the change to a lower level in doctrine, and in its *expression* by means of rites and administration as Cyprian about half a century later is approached, is evident, the conclusion that Tertullian and Cyprian are in the same line is inevitable. They are in the same line, though Tertullian holds, in respect of thought, a far higher position. There is no need here to enter upon any discussion of the deeper meaning of the Eucharist or of any rite as presented in the works of these two Latin writers. What concerns my modest task is to observe the marked meaning which the rite has acquired throughout one part of the Western Church which stood in close communication with other churches, all having the same forms of church life. With this fact in mind, it is but reasonable to conclude that, as Christians migrated to the province of Britain, the communities which would there gather, say during A.D. 180–200 or 200–50, would also share similar conceptions and usages. The Eucharist, as well as the teaching and baptism which prepared for it, must occupy a high place in the life of each community, varying according to the latter's capabilities for realizing its own best life.

We cannot tell whether the early pastors of churches in Britain were regarded as priests or not. Tertullian, though sparing in the use of terms implying priesthood, even in the *De Baptismo* (c. 17), when speaking, strange to say, of baptism, gives to the bishop the appellation of 'high priest'—*summus sacerdos*; in high scorn, also, he

[1] The words quoted appear in an account given of the Eucharist immediately following a baptism: καὶ ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία, i. *Apol.* 66.

calls the Bishop of Rome *pontifex maximus*: *sacerdotalia munera* appears once; the verb *offerre* is, I believe, more frequent. In the case of Cyprian the change is well known and universally acknowledged: the pastor or bishop is now priest; the Eucharist is a *sacrificium*. In the period covered by the writings of Tertullian and Cyprian, it is the bishop, and he alone, that is called 'priest'; and, though heathen 'priests' (*sacerdotes*) were everywhere numerous, it appears, from Cyprian's whole tone, that the underlying justification for the use of the term *sacerdos* by the Christians should be sought mainly, if not solely, in the Old Testament writings. As yet the term is limited to bishops; it has been held that Cyprian in *Ep.* i. 1 applies the term Levite to a presbyter, yet the whole passage leaves us in some doubt, though there can hardly be any doubt that some canons even of the end of the fourth century employ 'Levite' to designate a presbyter. Yet even so the language is priestly in tendency and connexion. In the works of Ambrose, however, 'priest' is everywhere employed, and applied to presbyters. The same use appears in the writings of his contemporaries Jerome and Augustine.

To anticipate for a moment a far later period in Britain, it may be observed that the sentiments and usage of the British Church are depicted by Gildas, who speaks of priests, altars, sacrifice (Eucharistic), plainly intimating that these conceptions of priesthood and sacrifice had, long before his time, become common and accepted by all, as the inheritance of an earlier age.

Our subject has been drawn out at considerable length in this chapter with the sole object of gaining a clear idea—an 'image of the mind'—of what a Christian Church would almost certainly have been in this island about A. D. 200. Something might be lost if we did not refer once more to the contents of one or two chapters wherein Tertullian describes customs for which no warrant can be found in Scripture, having, as he says, only *tradition* for origin, *custom* for sanction, and *loyalty* as motive for observing them. As showing how widespread was the observance of such customs, I might refer to an article in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchen-*

geschichte for March, 1908, where the materials are collected together for an account of the ritual of baptism as presented in the Canons of Hippolytus, Horner's *Ethiopic Canons* (1904), the Egyptian Church Order, as well as parts proved to be ancient in Books ii and viii of *The Apostolic Constitutions*. The early years of the third century are depicted in these pages. Let us, however, confine ourselves to Tertullian. 'I will begin,' he says, 'with baptism. Before we enter the water we give our testimony there on the spot, and some time previously in the church under the bishop's hand, that we renounce the devil, his pomp and his angels. Then we are thrice immersed, giving a somewhat longer answer than the Lord prescribed in the Gospel. After that we are received (by those who present us, or *sponsores*), and partake of a mixture of milk and honey, and for a week from that day we refrain from our daily bath. The sacrament of the Eucharist, commanded by the Lord at a meal-time and to all, we receive at meetings held before daybreak, but from the hand of none besides the Presidents (bishops). On a fixed day annually we make offerings for the dead and for the natal days (of the martyrs). On the Lord's Day we hold it unlawful to fast, or to worship on our knees; with the same privilege we have our rejoicing from Easter to Pentecost. . . . For these and the like observances (e.g. making the sign of the cross), if you ask for a rule of Scripture you will find none.'[1] It becomes clear, as we pass from earlier Christian writings of the second century, that in both East and West the progressive tendency of the Church had amplified and varied its way of life by additional customs, most of which have long ago fallen into desuetude in every Church, though some remain.[2]

This is the kind of Church that the vigour and activity of its members raised anew in Britain. It may be considered that the description is defective because there has been

[1] *De Corona Milit.* iii. 4 (A. D. 211). 'Natal days,' *natalicia*, survives now only in the Welsh word *Nadolig* (*natalic Crist*) for Christmas Day.

[2] On this point Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, c. 27, is highly instructive. Custom is not placed on an equality with Scripture: it suffices for ordinary practice.

no mention of what at a later period was called *chrism* or in some churches *confirmation*. I have, however, been led to accept the opinion held by several, that chrism was really at this early time part of the rite of baptism itself, and, what is of greater moment, always remained so in the British Church until the influence of Anglo-Roman customs began to tell upon her. This is but one of several features of a third-century Church which in the same way, and without change, retained their hold. Britain may have been conservative, yet a community that is adverse to change displays also a capacity for new ideas or conceptions not radically inconsistent with usage. The island was soon, undoubtedly, isolated from the Empire: was it so ecclesiastically? There may be much doubt on this point. The newer characteristics which came as additions, as well as the one mentioned as typical of persistence, will, I hope, become more clear later on.

If we transport ourselves half a century and go to Verulam about the time when St. Alban and the other Christians were awed by tidings of the cruel edicts of Decius, what should we see and hear? What manner of service would be there? The question could be more easily answered for Eastern countries than for the Western; yet we may inferentially take Tertullian for our guide in the belief that, for the West, the leading lines at least would be everywhere similar, though with frequent variations. Let us take the *Apologeticus*, about the best known of his works, and c. 39 itself will furnish an outline of what we seek. There was Public Prayer which included intercessory prayer 'for the emperors, for their ministers, and for those in power, for the welfare of public life, for peace and for a delay of the end'. Then followed the Reading of Scripture (*litterae divinae*). The sermon, or rather sermons, in the form of 'exhortations, rebukes and a divine censorship', have no unimportant place. Presiding over the whole are 'the approved elders' (*probati seniores*) who have obtained the place of honour, 'not for a price, but by attested character.' The *De Anima*, in mentioning a curious case of Montanist visions which took place during the *dominica sollemnia*, names the following parts of the service—Reading

of Scripture, Psalm-singing, Addresses, Prayers. It may be gathered from his censure of the heretics, for not distinguishing catechumen and believer, allowing to both the same share in the Church's prayers, that what is known to have prevailed elsewhere was usual in the churches known to him ; the second part of the service was exclusively for the faithful (*fideles*), after the congregation, which might contain heathen as well as catechumens, had left.[1] We have no means of judging what the character and order of this second part may have been beyond the fact that the Eucharist was then celebrated. For prayer, the ordinary attitude was standing, except on fast days, when public prayer was conducted kneeling.[2] On Sundays and the days from Easter to Pentecost there would be no kneeling for prayer.

The annual festival which the Church observed in commemoration of its redemption through the Saviour who suffered, died, and rose again, just as the holy Eucharist itself, was fated to cause strange divisions and strifes. From the first and for ages the two conceptions which enter into the idea of redemption, viz. the conceptions of the death and of the resurrection of the Lord, underlay the Church's idea of Easter (*τὸ πάσχα τοῦ κυρίου*), but it was the extent to which one or the other element predominated in the idea of the Lord's redemption which caused the earliest controversies such as culminated in the extreme step taken by Victor, the Bishop of Rome. Yet as the years passed by after A.D. 200, there was evident a decided majority in favour of regarding the Resurrection as the leading thought entering into the observance of the festival. There still remained differences, even in Gaul, as is evident from Nicetas, as late as A.D. 400, with respect to the day, yet Sunday came to be generally recognized as that on which it was to be celebrated.

We find further that, in the West, there was no fixed method of deciding which Sunday in March or April

[1] *De Praescr. Haeret.* c. 41 'Inprimis quis catechumenus, quis fidelis incertum est; pariter adeunt, pariter orant.'

[2] *De Orat.* 18. The evidence is everywhere in fact. Canon 20 of Nicea forbids kneeling on Sundays.

should be Easter Sunday, and this uncertainty continued until the beginning of the fourth century. When afterwards divergences and bitter controversies arose, we find that in Britain an eighty-four-year cycle and other peculiarities were tenaciously held to. Summarizing what has been said, it appears that a Church in Britain about A.D. 200 would be a Church of a Latin-speaking people; possibly its missionary efforts would reach the British people themselves through interpreters, just as several of the most noted evangelizers in the Christianizing of the English, by the evidence of Beda, were unacquainted with *their* language. Yet for both Latins and British the Church itself had but one language in its ritual and creed. The same organization would prevail here as elsewhere, though it must be remembered that our statements are inferential, and there is no certainty as to what might be termed its 'regularity' or 'validity', as is proved by the dearth of ecclesiastics' names. Doctrine had acquired an advanced development rich in its conceptions, as is witnessed by Irenaeus (Book III) for Gaul, and by Tertullian for proconsular Africa. I see no reason to doubt that Britain shared in the kind of thought, strongly Christian, vigorous, clear-speeched, which we enjoy in the pages of Tertullian. Usages, some of which have continued in the Roman and Greek Churches, some also which they condemned and have abandoned, many that all non-Roman communions have put aside—these, or such as these, were common in Britain then. Sunday was observed, probably also the fasts of Wednesday and Friday. Easter, as a Resurrection festival, observed on Sunday, and preceded by a day or two of fasting, and Pentecost were the only days of annual observance: but there was no fixed and definite method of computing the actual day of their occurrence until A.D. 314. It seems, indeed, difficult, if not impossible, for any Church of our own day to regard this early Church of Britain as its own, except in a very general sense. Resemblances may be emphasized, but the change has been immense, a change due to progress no less than to local deviation. It is wiser and, from the standpoint of the historian, more truthful not to advance any such

claims. Many of those we honour most, in Britain, France, and Germany, in their treatment of events in the life of the Church, have put questions of this character severely aside.

EXCURSUS A

Extracts from Ancient Christian Writers

I put together here the following extracts from early Greek and Latin writers bearing upon the question of Christianity in Roman Britain. They range from about A.D. 206 to 396, yet the latest among them relate to times earlier than themselves.

Tertullian. We repeat here that Harnack, *Die Chronologie*, ii. 288, places the date of the *Adv. Iudaeos* in A.D. 207–8; Nöldechen, in *Texte und Unt.*, vol. v, arrives at the date A.D. 195; Monceaux's date, *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne*, tome i, p. 208, is between 200 and 206.

Tert. *Adv. Iudaeos*, 7.

In quem enim alium universae gentes crediderunt nisi in Christum? qui iam venit? Cui enim et aliae gentes crediderunt? Parthi [. . .]. . . . Gaetulorum varietates, et Maurorum multi fines, Hispaniarum omnes termini, et Galliarum diversae nationes, et Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita, et Sarmatarum et Dacorum et Germanorum et Scytharum et abditarum multarum gentium et provinciarum et insularum multarum nobis ignotarum. . . .

Origen In Ezek. These homilies were written during the period of activity at Alexandria, that is, before 230. Alexandrian ships traded to all parts.

Origen, *Hom. IV in Ezek.*

Quando enim terra Britanniae ante adventum Christi in Unius Dei consensit religionem? Quando totus semel orbis? Nunc vero propter Ecclesias, quae mundi limites tenent, universa terra cum laetitia clamat ad Dominum Israel, etc.

Hom. VI in Luc.

Virtus Domini Salvatoris et cum his est qui ab orbe nostro in Britannia dividuntur, et cum his qui in Mauritania, et cum universis qui sub sole in nomine eius crediderunt. Vide ergo magnitudinem Salvatoris, quomodo in toto orbe diffusa sit.

Hom. XXVIII in Matt.

Non enim fertur praedicatum esse Evangelium apud omnes Aethiopas, . . . quid autem dicamus de Britannis aut Germanis qui sunt circa Oceanum, vel apud Barbaros, Dacos, et Sarmatas, et Scythas, quorum plurimi nondum audiverunt Evangelii verbum, audituri sunt autem in ipsa saeculi consummatione?

A comparison of Tertullian and Origen, in the lists they give representing the belief at Carthage and Alexandria, is instructive:—

Tertullian.	*Origen.*
Gaetuli	
Mauri	Mauri
Hispaniae	
Galliae	
Britanni	Britanni
Sarmatae	Sarmatae
Daci	Daci
Germani	Germani
Scythae	Scythae

Hippolytus, a noted Roman contemporary of Tertullian, is acquainted with the 'Bretannic' islands:—

ἕως Βρετανικῶν νήσων, πᾶσαί τε πρὸς Βορρᾶν βλέπουσαι. *Die Chronik des Hippolytus*, Adolph Bauer. In *Texte und Unt.*, N.F. xiv. I (1905).

Constantius, *Vita Germani*, written about A.D. 480, but referring to a martyrdom that took place, most probably, in the Decian or Valerian persecution, A.D. 250 or 257:—

Constantius, *Vita Germani*, I. 25.

Compressa itaque perversitate damnabili, ... sacerdotes ad B. Albanum Martyrem auctori Deo per ipsum gratias acturi properabant; ubi Germanus, omnium Apostolorum diversorumque martyrum reliquias secum habens, facta oratione iussit revelli sepulchrum, pretiosa ibidem munera conditurus. ... Quibus depositis honorifice atque sociatis, de loco ipso, ubi beati martyris effusus fuerat sanguis, massam pulveris secum portaturus abstulit; in qua apparebat cruore servato, rubere martyrum caedem, persecutore pallente.

Views held respecting the action of Constantius Chlorus during the persecution, A.D. 293–306, Eusebius, *H. E.* viii. The *History* i–ix was completed by A.D. 313–14.

Eusebius, *H. E.* viii. 13, 14.

Κωνστάντιος ... τοῦ καθ' ἡμῶν [χριστιανῶν] πολέμου μηδαμῶς ἐπικοινωνήσας ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτὸν θεοσεβεῖς ἀβλαβεῖς καὶ ἀνεπηρεάστους φυλάξας, καὶ μήτε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν τοὺς οἴκους καθελών, μήθ' ἕτερόν τι καθ' ἡμῶν καινουργήσας.

Id. *De Mart. Palaest.* xiii. 10, 11 [*c.* A.D. 325].

Τὰ γάρ τοι ἐπέκεινα τῶν δεδηλωμένων, Ἰταλία πᾶσα καὶ Σικελία, Γαλλία τε καὶ ὅσα κατὰ δυσμένον ἥλιον ἐπὶ Σπανίαν Μαυριτανίαν τε καὶ Ἀφρικήν, οὐδ' ὅλοις ἔτεσι δυσὶ τοῖς πρώτοις τοῦ διωγμοῦ τὸν πόλεμον ὑπομείναντα, ταχίστης ἠξιώθησαν ἐπισκοπῆς τε θεοῦ καὶ εἰρήνης. ... Εἰρήνης δὲ ἀπολαύουσιν οἱ ἐν θατέρῳ μέρει τῷ προδεδηλωμένῳ κατοικοῦντες ἀδελφοί.

Lactantius. This writer was intimate with the court of Constantine. See Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus*, 80. The *De Morte Persecutorum* was written about 314; some doubt its attribution to Lactantius.

Lactantius, *De Mort. Persecut.*

Constantius, ne dissentire a maiorum praeceptis videretur, conventicula, id est, parietes, qui restitui poterant, dirui passus est. verum autem Dei templum, quod est in hominibus, incolume servavit. Vexabatur ergo universa terra, et praeter Gallias ab oriente usque ad occasum tres acerbissimae bestiae saeviebant.

Athanasius mentions Britain twice in his polemical writings; he wrote to Jovian after his proclamation as emperor, A.D. 363:—

Athan. *Apol. Cont. Arian.* [c. A.D. 347–51].

Καὶ τρίτον ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ τῇ ἐν Σαρδικῇ συναχθείσῃ κατὰ πρόσταξιν τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων βασιλέων Κωνσταντίου καὶ Κώνσταντος· ἐν ᾗ καὶ οἱ καθ' ἡμῶν γενόμενοι καθηρέθησαν ὡς συκοφάνται, τοῖς δε κριθείσιν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν συνεψηφίσαντο μὲν ἐπίσκοποι πλείους τριακοσίων ἐξ ἐπαρχιῶν Αἰγύπτου. . . . Γαλλιῶν, Βρεττανιῶν.

Hist. Arian. ad Monach. Prol. c. 28 [A.D. 358].

Εἶτα βλέποντες τὴν πρὸς Ἀθανάσιον τῶν ἐπισκόπων συμφωνίαν τε καὶ εἰρήνην, πλείους δὲ ἦσαν υ', ἀπό τε τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης . . . τούς τε ἀπὸ Γαλλιῶν καὶ Βρεττανίας . . . ταῦτα βλέποντες ἐκεῖνοι φθόνῳ καὶ φόβῳ συνεσχέθησαν.

Ταύτην δὲ (πίστιν) οἱ ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνελθόντες ὁμολόγησαν πατέρες· καὶ ταύτῃ σύμψηφοι τυγχάνουσι πᾶσαι αἱ πανταχοῦ κατὰ τόπον Ἐκκλησίαι· αἵ τε κατὰ τὴν Σπανίαν καὶ Βρετανίαν καὶ Γαλλίας . . . καὶ αἱ κατὰ ἀνατολὰς Ἐκκλησίαι, παρὲξ ὀλίγων τῶν τὰ Ἀρείου φρονούντων. Ἁπάντων γὰρ τῶν προειρημένων καὶ πεῖραν ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν γνώμην καὶ γράμματα ἔχομεν.

After the Council of Nicaea Constantine wrote a circular letter to all parts of the empire. It shows how Britain was included as a not unimportant part of the empire for Christian unity in the uniform observance of Easter Day, A.D. 325.

Eusebius of Constantius, *Vita Const.* iii. 17.

Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τοῦτ' οὐχ οἷόν τε ἦν ἀκλινῆ καὶ βεβαίαν τάξιν λαβεῖν, εἰ μὴ εἰς ταὐτὸ πάντων ὁμοῦ ἡ τῶν γοῦν πλειόνων ἐπισκόπων συνελθόντων . . . τούτου ἕνεκεν πλείστων ὅσων συναθροισθέντων. . . .

Ib. xix.

Καλῶς ἔχειν ἅπαντες ἡγήσαντο . . . ἵν' ὅπερ δ' ἂν κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν τε καὶ Ἀφρικήν, Ἰταλίαν τε ἅπασαν, Αἴγυπτον, Σπανίας, Γαλλίας, Βρεττανίας . . . μιᾷ καὶ συμφώνῳ φυλάττηται γνώμῃ, ἀσμένως τοῦτο καὶ ἡ ὑμετέρα προσδέξηται σύνεσις . . . ἵνα δὲ τὸ κεφαλαιωδέστερον συντόμως εἴπω, κοινὴ πάντων ἥρεσε κρίσει τὴν ἁγιωτάτην τοῦ πάσχα ἑορτὴν μιᾷ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ συντελεῖσθαι.

Hilary of Poitiers, on account of his constancy to the faith of Nicaea and loyalty to Athanasius, was exiled to the East by Constantius II. In 358 he wrote acknowledging the kind concern his brother bishops and others had felt in him, during the time of his cruel severance from them. The letter shows a spirit of wise concession as to the controversy which was dividing men who were really of the same faith. A similar noble aspiration making for recon-

ciliation and unity was felt by others also, and led to the important Council of 362 at Alexandria. The letter is addressed *to the bishops of Britain* as well as to those of Gaul.

Hilar. Pictav., *De Synodis.*

Dilectissimis et beatissimis fratribus et co-episcopis provinciae Germaniae Primae . . . et ex Narbonensi plebibus et clericis Tolosanis, et *provinciarum Britanniarum Episcopis*, Hilarius servus Christi in Deo et Domino nostro aeternam salutem . . . Beatae fidei vestrae litteris sumptis (quarum lentitudinem ac raritatem de exsilii mei et longitudine et secreto intelligo constitisse), gratulatus sum in Domino incontaminatos vos et illaesos ab omni contagio detestandae haereseos perstitisse.

Sulpitius Severus, *Historia Sacra*, ii. 41 (c. 400), mentions the Council held at Ariminum in 359, May 22, and has preserved a very interesting fact about certain British bishops:—

Igitur apud Ariminum, urbem Italiae, synodum congregari iubet (Constantius); idque Tauro praefecto imperat, ut collectos in unum non ante dimitteret quam in unam fidem consentirent; promisso eidem consulatu, si rem effectui tradidisset. Ita missis per Illyricum, Italiam, Africam, Hispanias, Galliasque, magistris officialibus, acciti aut macti quadringenti et aliquanto amplius occidentales Episcopi, Ariminum convenere; quibus omnibus annonas et cellaria dare imperator praeceperat: sed id nostris (id est, Aquitanis) Gallis, et Britannis, indecens visum; repudiatis fiscalibus, propriis sumtibus vivere maluerunt. Tres tantum ex Britannia, inopia proprii, publico usi sunt, cum oblatam a caeteris collationem respuissent; sanctius putantes fiscum gravare, quam singulos. Hoc ego Gavidium Episcopum nostrum, quasi obtrectantem, referre solitum audivi: sed longe aliter senserim, laudique attribuo Episcopis tam pauperes fuisse, ut nihil proprium haberent, neque ab aliis potius quam fisco sumerent, ubi neminem gravabant; ita in utrisque egregium exemplum.

The writings of Jerome imply a belief that Britain was at an early period part of that great world over the whole of which the name of Christ was preached. The dates are Grützmacher's.

Hieronymi *Orthod. et Lucif. Altercatio*, about A.D. 382.

Si Ecclesiam non habet Christus, aut si in Sardinia tantum habet, nimium pauper factus est. Et si Britannias, Gallias, Orientem, Indorum populos, barbaras nationes, et totum semel mundum, possidet Satanas; quomodo ad angulum universae cunctarum gentium et voces et litterae sonant.

Id. *Ep.* 77. 10, *ad Oceanum* [A. D. 399].

Xenodochium in portu Romano situm totus pariter mundus audivit. Sub una aestate didicit Britannia, quod Aegyptus et Parthus noverant vere.

Id. *Ep.* 146. 1, *ad Evangelum* [anno incerto].

Nec altera Romanae urbis Ecclesia, altera totius orbis existimanda est. Et Galliae et Britanniae et Africa et Persis et Oriens et India, et omnes barbarae nationes, unum Christum adorant, unam observant regulam veritatis.

Id. *Ep.* 46. 10, *Paulae et Eustochii ad Marcellam* [A. D. 382-5].

Divisus ab orbe nostro Britannus si in religione processerit, occiduo sole dimisso, quaerit locum, fama sibi tantum et Scripturarum relatione cognitum.

Id. *Ep.* 58. 3, *ad Paulinum* [A. D. 396].

Caeterum qui dicunt Templum Domini, Templum Domini, audiant ab apostolo: 'Vos estis templum Domini, et Spiritus Sanctus habitat in vobis.' Et de Ierosolymis et de Britannia aequaliter patet aula celestis; regnum enim Dei intra vos est.

Id. *Ep.* 60. 4, *ad Heliodorum* [A. D. 396].

Adde quod ante resurrectionem Christi notus tantum in Iudaea erat Deus. . . . Ubi tunc totius orbis homines ab India usque ad Britanniam? . . . Piscium ritu ac locustarum, et velut muscae et culices, conterebantur. . . . Nunc passionem Christi et resurrectionem eius . . . sonant.

CHAPTER V

PERSECUTION

By three rules or principles Trajan defined his desire, if not to mitigate persecution, at least to save it from the lawless fury of popular hatred. Christians, he ruled, were not to be sought out; if they were accused and convicted, punishment (of death) had necessarily to be inflicted, and no anonymous indictment was to be accepted against any one.[1] The first of these rules, though sometimes broken, as in the case of Polycarp, continued to be the empire's guiding principle in this matter until Marcus Aurelius, the mild Stoic, took to the work of harassing and killing the Christians. But persecution was still only intermittent, local, and sporadic.

With the Edict of A. D. 202 which Septimius Severus promulgated against the Christians a new situation was created: persecution then became an official act of administration. It was against the proscription under the old law that Tertullian addressed his *Apologeticus* (about 197) to the Roman magistrates (*Romani imperii antistites*) in Proconsular Africa. The new situation, wherein the State itself promoted hostilities against the Christians, became more terribly definite under Decius (250–1) and Valerian (257–60). Their Edicts started a war of extermination directed not merely against individual Christians but against the Christian Church as a corporate body. There had been practical toleration under several emperors from about 210 to 235; local outbursts had taken place under Maximinus Thrax (235–8), but Philip 'the Arabian' had observed a direct policy of peace which lasted about six years, that is, until the terrible storm burst in the second year of the cool fanatic, Decius. The latter's Edict of 250 aimed at the suppression of the new religion in the interest of imperial unity, which he connected with the recognized national heathen worship.

[1] Pliny's Epistle to Trajan and Trajan's Rescript, *Epp.* x. 97.

The *De Lapsis* of Cyprian, in which he describes the 'fall' of so many, is a sad book to read: yet numerous as were the renegades, a noble few, such as those named by Cyprian, or by Lucianus in *Ep.* 22, were lacking scarcely anywhere. For the Edict, the first of the kind, embraced the whole empire. It would thus be published in Britain, and may have been followed by the same results as elsewhere —many *lapsi*, a few faithful. This persecution came to an end sooner than was expected, having lasted from the beginning of 250 to April or May 251. It arose afresh under Valerian, who, even more than Decius, attempted to destroy the organized life which the Christians had established and maintained in their Church. By attacking the Church's ministry, he aimed at the destruction of the collective activity of the Christians; their assemblies were prohibited, their common properties confiscated or sequestered. Valerian's Edict appeared in 257, and the persecution lasted from the spring of that year to the autumn of 260.[1]

These Edicts of Decius and Valerian were probably the first edicts of persecution promulgated in Britain. A fairly sound conclusion may, I believe, be established to the effect that St. Alban of Verulam, and others, of whom two are named with him, suffered in one or other of these persecutions. St. Alban is known to us from Gildas's book *De Excidio Britanniae*, cc. 10, 11; from the *Vita Germani* of Constantius; from the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Beda, i, cc. 7, 18, 20; also from one line of the Christian poet, Fortunatus.[2]

[1] On Decius see Cyprian's *De Lapsis*, cc. 5 ff. (Hartel, i, p. 240 ff.); several Epistles, from *Ep.* 1 to *Ep.* 15: on Valerian, Cyprian, *Ep.* 80, *Acta proconsularia S. Cypriani* in Hartel, iii, or in Ruinart's *Acta* (from this document we learn the character of the emperor's enactments). Cf. Allard, *Les Dernières Persécutions du IIIe Siècle*, p. 33 ff.

[2] Venantius Fortunatus, the *Opera Poetica*, edited by Fr. Leo in *Monum. Germ. Hist.*, tom. iv. 1:—

> Africa Cyprianum, dat Siscia clara Quirinum;
> Vincenti Hispana surgit ab arce decus;
> Egregium Albanum fecunda Britannia profert.

Fortunatus came to Gaul in 565, and at the time of his death, 608, was Bishop of Poitiers.

It is practically certain that Gildas has included a fragment of some ancient *Passio* in his own work: the whole tone of the passage (c. 11), with its peculiarly miraculous element, thus early asserting itself as an essential constituent of a *Passio*, is characteristic. Gildas is borrowing from this *Passio*. But that Alban suffered in the Diocletian persecution is simply *a conjecture* on the part of the British writer, as he himself admits:[1] 'He of his own free gift, in the above-mentioned persecution, *as we gather*,' so he writes, 'kindled for us bright lamps of holy martyrs, lest Britain should be completely in the thick darkness of black night.' These were 'Alban of Verulam, Aaron and Julius of Caerlleon, and others of both sexes, in different places, who stood firm with lofty nobleness of mind in Christ's battle'. The locality of their suffering is not mentioned; judging by many other *Acta*, from Justin Martyr's down, we may gather that persons from different parts would appear before the same judge, and suffer at the same place; but neither the narrative of Gildas nor the *Passio* copied by him suggests the identification of the scene of their martyrdom with Verulam, i.e. St. Albans, any more than with Caerlleon on Usk. It would rather seem, so far as any credit can be given to the *Passio*, to be some spot near the Thames, because, as the soldiers led him to execution, the martyr 'by fervent prayer opened an unknown way along the bed of the noble river Thames'. Alban, a heathen, compassionately concealed in his house a Christian fleeing from persecution, and having been converted to the same faith by the influence of this fugitive, exchanged garments with him and suffered in his stead. In brief, such are the features of the story as known to Gildas.

[1] Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, c. 10 'Qui gratuito munere supra dicto, *ut conicimus*, persecutionis tempore, ne penitus crassa atrae noctis caligine Britannia obfuscaretur, clarissimos lampades sanctorum martyrum nobis accendit, quorum nunc corporum sepulturae et passionum loca, si non lugubri divortio barbarorum quamplurima ob scelera nostra civibus adimerentur, non minimum intuentium mentibus ardorem divinae charitatis incuterent; sanctum Albanum Verolamiensem, Aaron et Iulium Legionum urbis cives, caeterosque utriusque sexus diversis in locis summa magnanimitate in acie Christi perstantes dico.'

Beda, in relating the story of Alban's martyrdom, evidently borrows it, as Gildas had done nearly two centuries before, from a *Passio*, but a *Passio* which, by that time, was circulating in the English churches also. The story has novel features. The fugitive Christian is here a cleric; the account of the trial and execution is expanded; a river divides in two, but it is not named Thames; the place of suffering is stated to be Verulam (St. Albans). Besides Gildas, Fortunatus, and Beda, the Life of Germanus by Constantius, from which Beda quotes, i. 17–21, written probably about 480, though not in the form now current, mentions a visit paid by Germanus of Auxerre and Lupus of Troyes, A.D. 429, to the tomb of St. Alban. 'The priests (i.e. bishops) sought the blessed martyr Albanus in order to render thanks by his mediation to God; and here Germanus, having with him relics of all the apostles and of different martyrs, offered prayer, and commanded the grave to be opened in order to deposit the precious gifts therein' (c. 18).

The *Passiones* have various grades of historical value; they begin with the genuine *Martyrium Polycarpi* written *c.* A.D. 155, and include other equally genuine *Acta*, such as those of Justin Martyr and his companions, the martyrs of Lyon, the Scillitan martyrs, Perpetua and Felicitas, Pionius of Smyrna, Cyprian of Carthage, and others, between thirty and forty in number,[1] until we approach the time of Constantine. This class of literature became widely popular, the narratives being regarded as specially edifying. Soon, however, the narratives, though not without an historical basis, became largely, and in some instances entirely, imaginary. A process even arose of borrowing and utilizing the same *Passio* over again for quite different personages. Now among those which fail to be classed as entirely genuine is the *Passio* of Albanus. There is no reason to doubt that in the Decian and Valerian persecutions there were in Britain many martyrs, of whom Albanus was one; but he was hardly the first, according to Beda's own account, because Beda

[1] See Bardenhewer, *Gesch. der altkirch. Lit.*, ii, pp. 611 ff.

represents the persecution as *ending* with St. Alban's death. More fortunate than others who were unknown, it was given to him to find one who adapted older *Acta* to commemorate him, and so create a halo of special sanctity around his memory. There were, however, others whose names, and nothing more, have come down to us. Gildas is the first in Britain to acquaint us with St. Alban's martyrdom, and I fail to see any reason for saying, as Mr. Plummer does, that 'the story of Aaron and Julius must be considered extremely doubtful'. One special reason assigned is the absence of local tradition. But there must have been the same tradition about these 'citizens of Caerlleon and others of both sexes in different places' during the early years of the sixth century as about St. Alban. Historical no doubt the martyrdom of Alban is, but not more so than that of the two men from the banks of Usk. The place-name cannot count, because 'St. Albans', as a place-name, is later than A. D. 731, when Beda wrote; for to him the name, besides Verulamium, is Verulamcaestir or Vaeclingacaestir,[1] and, for this reason, ought not to be regarded as furnishing any early local tradition. The martyr suffered near the river Thames, according to one form of the *Passio*, near *a* river in any case, so that St. Albans may not have been the place of martyrdom, nor Alban the *first* martyr of Britain. We, in fact, find, among about eighteen *Merthirs* mentioned in the Book of Llandâv, a *Merthir Iun* (= *Jul*) *et Aaron* situated on the river Usk (pp. 225, 226, cf. 377). This name *Merthir* often occurs, being the British form of *Martyrium*, the term used since the fourth century to designate a church built over the grave of a martyr, and supplies a tradition on the spot that must be considerably older than the Book of Llandâv itself. One codex (Cod. Bern. *c.* A. D. 770) of Jerome's Martyrology, used by De Rossi and Duchesne for their edition of that work, inserts at June 22: 'in Britain *Albinus martyr* along with others, 889 in number, placed in

[1] Beda, *H. E.* i. 7, p. 71 in Plummer's edition: 'iuxta civitatem Verulamium, quae nunc a gente Anglorum Verulamcaestir sive Vaeclingacaestir appellatur.' Plummer connects the second with Watling Street, as Verulam was situated on that famous road.

the list of those whose names are written in the book of life.'[1] This number, 889, is an example of the way in which the words of Gildas, 'others of both sexes in different places,' underwent amplification.[2] We have in the names and places discussed above, particularly in the numerous *Merthirs*, intimations of the extent covered by the persecution, and so of the extent to which Christian churches had increased in Britain by the year 257, when St. Cyprian of Carthage suffered under decrees which the governor described to him at his trial as including condemnation of both bishops and presbyters, and prohibiting the holding of assemblies anywhere or meeting in cemeteries ('non solum de episcopis verum etiam de presbyteris mihi scribere dignati sunt. . . . Praeceperunt etiam ne in aliquibus locis conciliabula fiant nec coemeteria ingrediantur.' *Acta S. Cypriani*, i). The relaxation under Gallienus (A. D. 260), which granted freedom to the Church's life and ministry, restoring the sequestrations made under Valerian, must have affected Britain. Here, also, would be experienced the toleration and quiet which practically prevailed throughout the empire for about forty years, or from 260 to 303.[3]

EXCURSUS B

The Martyrdom of St. Alban

Whilst working on the edition of Gildas prepared by him for the Cymmrodorion Society, the present writer was struck by the fact that the only place in the *De Excidio* where Gildas introduces any element of the miraculous is in the narrative of the martyrdom of Alban. 'Being in this way

[1] *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*, p. 81. The codex is described in Prolegomena ix, x, where the exemplar from which it was copied, or one of its progenitors, is described as having been used or written by some Irish ecclesiastic, as the names of Irish Saints—Brigida, Patrick, and Comgall—have been inserted.

[2] See Allard, *Les Persécutions*, vol. iv, p. 40, n. 2. He, however, places the martyrdom in A. D. 287.

[3] On the severity of the Decian and Valerian persecutions, see Dr. Bigg, *The Origins of Christianity*, ch. xxvii.

well pleasing to God, during the time between his holy confession and cruel death, in the presence of the impious men who carried the Roman standard with odious haughtiness, he was wonderfully adorned with miraculous signs, so that, by fervent prayer, he opened an unknown way over the bed of the noble river Thames, similar to that little-trodden way of the Israelites, when the ark of the covenant stood long on the gravel in the middle of Jordan; accompanied by a thousand men, he walked through with dry foot, the rushing waters on either side hanging like abrupt precipices, and converted first his executioner, as he saw such wonders, from a wolf into a lamb, and caused him together with himself to thirst more deeply for the triumphant palm of martyrdom, and more bravely to seize it.' These words of Gildas are taken from some *Passio* or *Acta* of St. Alban; in the same way Beda borrows, writing about two centuries later. Confirmation of this borrowing is now afforded us in the investigations of Prof. Wilhelm Meyer of Göttingen, in *Die Legende des h. Albanus des Protomartyr Angliae in Texten vor Beda.*[1] Meyer remarks that in the *Passio* used by Gildas the time of actual martyrdom was not stated, since he adds, '*in supra dicto, ut conicimus, persecutionis tempore,*' intimating that the fixing of it in the Diocletian persecution is simply his own conjecture; neither does he mention any place of execution. The abstract, however, is so short and so condensed that it is difficult to fix upon its earliest original. Not so in the case of Beda, who gives the legend at length (see Plummer's edition, Book i, c. 7). St. Alban was as yet a heathen when he sheltered a 'cleric' who was fleeing from his persecutors, by whose prayers and the example of his faith and godliness he was converted, and became a Christian *integro ex corde.* It became known that the cleric was hiding with Alban, and soldiers were sent to arrest him. Suddenly Alban presented himself to the soldiers in the cleric's garb, and was led in chains to the judge. The judge, himself then at an altar, commanded him to make an offering to the gods. Alban refused and was tortured, but when he was being led to execution, on coming to the river, he struck and divided it, and so crossed over dry-shod. The executioner, among others, was so impressed that he prayed for martyrdom himself, 'cum martyre vel pro martyre.' At the place of execution St. Alban prays God to give him water to drink, when

[1] See also the able review of this work in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. xxiv, p. 397.

suddenly a fountain springs up from the earth; with the martyr's head the eyes of the man who decapitated him fell on the ground; the other, who was to have been executioner, 'though not washed in the fountain of baptism, was made clean in the laver of his own blood, and made worthy to enter into the kingdom of heaven.' The martyrdom of Alban Beda fixes on the '22nd of June, at Verulam, where later a church worthy of him was built, and to this day ("usque ad hanc diem") (A.D. 731) cures and the working of powers have not ceased there'. Much is omitted in this abstract of mine, but the additions made in Beda's narrative should be marked.

The originals of the story as here told can be traced. One, probably the earliest, is a MS. now at Turin, another a Paris MS. which in various ways supplements the Turin text, and the third a MS. at Autun. The oldest, or even the original, form of the legend, as it was put into shape in Middle Gaul (not in Britain) between 500 and 540, is represented by the text of Turin, which was brought over and became known to Gildas. Beda, however, used an exemplar of the Paris text, while that of Autun has other representatives among MSS. in the British Museum, Gray's Inn, and Einsiedeln. Priority being assigned to the Turin text, it may be said that all three, after allowing for additions, modifications, and omissions, seem to indicate a common original. We know how Constantius, in the *Vita Germani*, made the name of St. Alban famous in Gaul about 480. It is not improbable that the writing of the *Passio* was stimulated by his account of the visit of Germanus and Lupus to the martyr's grave.

But, like many other hagiographical *Acta*, this *Passio* seems to have been put together out of older materials, a habit in which writers of such pieces indulged without compunction. When they had a fact or two to build upon, the descriptive details were freely borrowed and used over again. There was an Irenaeus, an Andochus, a Benignus Tyrsis and Felix legend, originally one, but afterwards separated into three; there was also a story of the boy Symphorianus of Autun, whose own mother encouraged him as he was led to execution, bidding him 'keep the living God in his heart' ('Nate, nate, Symphoriane, in mente habe Deum vivum'. See Ruinart's *Martyria* [1]). Meyer finds parallel

[1] For Celtic scholars it is interesting to find in a MS. of the ninth century what seems a reminiscence of a very old form of the beautiful story of Symphorian, according to which the mother encourages the boy in the Celtic or Gallic tongue; only three words, however, are preserved. 'The venerable mother earnestly and openly instructs him from the wall,

passages in the structure of the *Passio* of St. Alban ; and so, as we acquire knowledge of its literary origin, we lose confidence in the genuineness of its details. What date should be assigned to this suffering of the 'first martyrs', Alban, Julius, Aaron ? It is evident that Gildas did not know, neither do the *Passiones* furnish any reliable indication. There are good reasons for excluding the years 286–296, also 296–306 ; from 306 onward, persecution for Britain and Gaul was made impossible by Constantine ; going behind the Edict of Gallienus in 260 as being a time of practical toleration, we come to the Valerian persecution. Hence under Valerian, or under Decius, these British martyrs may have been put to death, as suggested in Gildas's own descriptive phrases, and even by the tone and style of the *Passio* from which, though in slightly varying forms, both he and Beda quote.

saying *in Gallic* : "My son, my son, Synforianus, *memento betoto divo*," that is, "remember thy God." "Venerabilis mater sua de muro sedula et nota illum *voce gallica* monuit dicens : Nate, nate, Synforiane, *memento betoto divo*, hoc est memorare dei tui."' Another MS. has '*mentem obeto divo*'. The scribes of the MSS., as usual, did not know the language used by the mother, the *vox Gallica*, for these words may have to be arranged differently.

CHAPTER VI

BRITAIN AND THE DIOCLETIAN PERSECUTION.

After a period of extreme disorder, the empire had peace and unity restored to it under Diocletian, who, in consequence of his great services to the State, has been termed a second Augustus. Under his rule—it might almost be said, by his favour—the period from 282 to 303 witnessed a rapid growth in the number of Christians everywhere. It was part of the 'forty years' of rest initiated by the toleration rescript of Gallienus, and, probably, had Diocletian remained sole ruler, there would have been no persecution. His experience in the civil wars had taught Diocletian that only by a regular devolution of authority could the empire be kept together, and prevented from breaking up into fragments. There were elements of disruption in many quarters, though the most pressing necessity was that of opposing the barbarian hosts on the frontiers. Consequently a division of authority to be determined by the lines of these frontiers was inaugurated. In 285 Maximian was associated with Diocletian as Caesar, and the task of guarding the West was assigned to him. Thus from 285 to 293 Britain might, except for Carausius, be under the direct rule of this man, who was so cruel as to be unfit to rule. On the 1st of March, 293, a further division was made whereby[1] Maximian became Emperor or Augustus in the West, having Constantius Chlorus subordinate to him with the title of Caesar: in the East Diocletian and Galerius became respectively Augustus and Caesar. Italy, Africa (proconsular), and Spain were assigned to Maximian; Gaul and Britain, with a capital at Trier or at York, fell to Constantius Chlorus, so well known

[1] These dates, 285, 293, are those given in Goyau, *Chronologie de l'Empire romain.*

both on his own account and also as the father of Constantine the Great. The motive in the arrangement was military, being necessitated by the inroads of the barbarians, and by other difficulties of the empire. For instance, the Teutons were giving trouble on the Rhine, and in Britain Carausius had succeeded in making himself emperor since 286. Maximian was no statesman, only a brutal soldier; Constantius was both a successful general and a capable administrator.

On his march to Gaul, Maximian proved himself a violent persecutor of the Christians, and in Gaul itself the same excess of cruelty was continued. Several *Acta* represent certain governors, instigated by his example and policy, as taking the initiative in the same course. Now it is about this time, after Maximian's arrival in Gaul, September, 286, that the persecutions in Britain resulting in the martyrdom of Alban, Julius, Aaron, and others, are placed by Tillemont (vol. iv, pp. 508 ff.), with whom Allard agrees.[1] But we call to mind that Britain, as already stated, had passed to the rule of the insurgent Emperor Carausius since the last months of 286, and that under him and his successor Allectus it was for ten years independent of the central imperial authority at Trier or Milan. Such irregular exercise of imperial power would most likely turn out to the profit of the Christians.

The Western Caesar, Constantius Chlorus, it may be repeated, held the Gauls and Britain, or more correctly the Britains (*Britanniae*),[2] to which, perhaps, Spain should be added. Something must be said of him. He was born in Illyricum, and had become qualified for his high position by experience in war and in administration. In the latter capacity he was possessed of qualities which rendered him a suitable associate of Maximian, the rough, energetic soldier devoid of political talent. In the army he had held several commands, and had been civil governor of Dalmatia. From the account given of him by his son, he was a monotheist, and inclined, by the kindliness of his nature and good sense,

[1] *La Persécution de Dioclétien*, pp. 40, 41.

[2] This is the division given by the Emperor Julian in *Orat.* 2 (Hertlein's ed., i. 65. 4): Lactantius, *De Morte Persecutorum*, 8, places Spain under Maximian.

to be respectful in his attitude towards the Christians, although he himself was not one of them. They, on the other hand, trusted and honoured him. All accounts leave upon our mind the impression of a brave, capable general, a just, unselfish and fair-minded ruler.

Maximian had so far failed to strengthen the Western empire that he was under the necessity of coming to terms with Carausius, and recognizing his rule in Britain. We have noticed the great number of coins found in Gaul and Britain bearing the name of Carausius, a fact which proves how firmly established was his position in Britain, and how completely intercourse between the island and Gaul lay in his power. Carausius held Boulogne (Gesoriacum) and had the Franks as allies. The latter, even after a successful siege of Boulogne by Constantius, had to be subdued, and a fleet to be constructed for that purpose. But when preparations were being hastened, there came the news that Allectus, the praetorian prefect of Britain, had succeeded in winning over the soldiers of Carausius, had defeated him, and had assumed the title of Augustus. This accession of a new usurper, of whom also many well-struck coins are known, made the preparations still more urgent. Constantius continued these preparations[1] until the end of 295. The spring of 296 saw his forces moving from two points: the praetorian prefect Asclepiodotus sailed from the mouth of the Seine, and, aided by a fog, succeeded in reaching the Isle of Wight, where he landed his troops, while the Caesar himself, a little later, crossed from Boulogne to the Thames. Allectus was defeated and killed near London in an unexpected skirmish with Asclepiodotus. Constantius treated Britain, now, owing to long semi-independence, a flourishing country, with great moderation. His well-known character won the loyal attachment of the mixed population over whom he ruled, his residence being, from time to time, at Eboracum (York).

February of the year 303 saw the appearance of the perse-

[1] Eutropius, ix. 22, 2. Many details of the operations of Constantius are related in Panegyric vii, addressed to Constantine, cc. 5, 6; *Panegyrici Latini* (Baehrens' edition). The passages are also given in the *Mon. Hist. Britannica*.

cuting Edict. It followed lines suggested by the earlier Edicts of Maximinus and Valerian. All, according to their status, were subject to its penalties; no mention of the clergy was made in it; the penalty of death was not to be imposed. Churches were to be suppressed or destroyed, not sequestered merely as under Valerian. On these points its measures were more rigorous than those of Valerian's Edict. The Scriptures were to be carried away or destroyed, probably because they were regarded as books of magic: in this, again, Diocletian was following older methods of procedure. Another Edict was published in the same year.[1] One passage of Lactantius relates that the Edict was *sent to* Maximian and Constantius in a dispatch. 'Etiam literae ad Maximianum et Constantium conmeaverunt, ut eadem facerent' (*D. M. P.* c. 15. 6). It may be observed that as Galerius could instigate severe measures in the East, so Constantius Chlorus could mitigate them in the West, though, at the same time, formally carrying out the Edict. Such was the trend of affairs during the last fifteen years of the third century and the early years of the fourth.

As the Edict was issued in 303, we are at present discussing a period of time not extending over more than three years, for Constantius died at York in 306. From that year, by the rise of his son Constantine, persecution was made impossible in Gaul and Britain (Lactantius, *De Morte Persec.* c. 24). The Edicts, however, were in force during these three years, and Maximian in Italy carried them out rigorously. But in the passage where Lactantius describes Maximian the Augustus as entering on this work 'with goodwill' ('libens paruit per Italiam'), he speaks as follows of the Caesar: 'For Constantius, so as not to appear to disregard the commands of his superiors, allowed the places of meeting, mere walls which could be restored, to be destroyed,

[1] On the beginning and progress of the persecution we consult Lactantius (or Pseudo-Lactantius, as Preuschen calls him), *De Morte Persecutorum*, cc. 10–16, 17, 21–2, 33–4; Eusebius, *H. E.* viii. 2. 6–8, 13. 17; *De Martyribus Palaestinensibus*, Introd. Lactantius wrote his work in 314, and Eusebius these portions between 312 and 314.

but preserved intact the true Temple of God, which is in men.'[1]

Diocletian and Maximian were the superiors (*maiores*) of the Caesar Constantius, and therefore some amount of observance of the Edict was judged politic on his part. At the first he may have been unable to save a few lives, as many of the governors of provinces may have been heathen. We note these facts because this is the period (303–6) fixed upon by many, in opposition to Tillemont and Allard, the supporters of 286, as the occasion of the martyrdoms in Britain. This view is energetically championed by Görres in the *Zeitschrift für wissensch. Theologie*, 1888, xxxi, p. 83, and seems by far the most probable, unless one adopt, as has been done in our pages, the earlier period of suffering, under Decius or Valerian (A.D. 250 or 257).[2]

Diocletian had not counted upon the strength of Christian resistance, neither had Maximian nor Galerius: Constantius knew it, and prudently acted upon his knowledge in the way described by Lactantius. The Christians found their lives and property respected, though the churches in which they met were destroyed. Assurance was given them with the well-known kindness of disposition that characterized the intelligent and thoughtful Caesar. On the 1st of May, 305, by the abdication of Diocletian and Maximian, he and Galerius became Augusti: Constantius, with Flavius Severus as Caesar, ruled the West, still keeping Trier and York as capitals of Gaul and Britain respectively; Italy and Africa were assigned to Severus. His time was short. Early in 306, February or March, Constantine had escaped from the camp of Galerius, and, joining his father at Gesoriacum (Boulogne),

[1] 'Nam Constantius, ne dissentire a maiorum praeceptis videretur, conventicula, id est parietes, qui restitui poterant, dirui passus est, uerum autem dei templum, quod est in hominibus, incolume seruauit,' *De Morte Persec.* 15. 6.

[2] Usserius. *Antiquitates*, c. vii. Ussher is copious on the persecution in Britain (pp. 170–211), which he takes for granted as occurring during or after 303 (Vol. iv, p. 512). The whole of ch. vii is a strange but deeply interesting mixture; though we are unable to accept it we cannot but admire its fine thoroughness.

accompanied him to Britain, where Constantius died on the 25th of July of the same year.[1]

One view of the part taken by Constantius in the persecution is given above in the words of Lactantius; but Eusebius in his History, viii. 13. 1, seems to contradict him, when he states that Constantius 'destroyed no church buildings'. Yet even such a statement should be coupled with what the Donatist bishops wrote in their letter to Constantine (A. D. 314), in which they requested that a Council on their difference with Caecilian of Carthage should be held in Gaul. Their reason was that Gaul had not suffered from the persecution. It thus appears safe to conclude that, owing to the intervention of Constantius, injury was not inflicted upon Christians in either Gaul or Britain during the years 303–6. In the previous decade, 286–96, Britain had been practically an independent state under Carausius and Allectus. On these two grounds it seems unlikely that any persecution, involving the martyrdom of St. Alban and others, could have taken place at any time between 286 and 306.[2] If we take into account the Gallo-Roman empire, recognized by the troops in Britain and Spain, which lasted from 259 to 273, as well as the generally attested peace which followed the Rescript of Gallienus in 260 (Eus. *H. E.* vii. 13), lasting in round numbers 'forty years', we are taken back to the time of Valerian. The inference thus seems natural that Britain's 'first martyr', or, as one would prefer to say, 'the first three' *known* martyrs, suffered death not under Diocletian, but either under Decius (251) or under Valerian (257).

[1] Panegyricus vii, addressed to Constantine himself (c. 5), gives these facts of the two meeting at Boulogne and crossing over to Britain together. Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, i. 21, and Lactantius, *De Morte Persec.* c. 24, with less probability, represent Constantius as dying when his son reached Boulogne. The date of his death is given in the Chronicle of Idatius printed in Mommsen's *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, vol. i of *Chronica Minora*.

[2] The interval 296–303 is covered by the Caesarship of Constantius: in fact Maximian himself, with other graver difficulties facing him, seems to have ceased from troubling the Churches after about two years' time. See Allard, *Les Pers. de Diocl.*, p. 85.

At this point we may sum up the leading facts known to history respecting Constantius. He was born, as was said, of a noble family in Illyricum, and before his elevation had served in the army, as well as in a civil capacity as governor of Dalmatia. His first visit to Britain was in the expedition against Allectus, in which he was aided by his praetorian prefect Asclepiodotus (296). His son Constantine would then be about twenty-two years of age, having been born at Naissus A. D. 274. Whether Helena was the wife of Constantius or not is a disputed point: if she was his wife, she must have been divorced when he married Theodora in 293. Constantine, whose birth was legitimatized, always held his mother in great reverence, a reverence that was paid to her on all sides as a woman of strong intellect and elevated Christian character. She was also proclaimed *Augusta*. The miraculous discoveries in Palestine belong to later times. Sozomen's account of her in Book ii, c. 2, gives fairly well the estimation in which the Augusta Helena, afterwards the *Sancta* or *Beata Helena*, was held by her own and the following generation. The fact that Constantine was over twenty years of age when his father first visited Britain disposes of the idea that she was the daughter of a British king—Coel—who had succeeded to the throne by killing 'King Asclepiodotus'.[1] Constantius died at York in 306, having been emperor only thirteen months.

A confused notice respecting his grave is found in Nennius (c. 25): 'Constantinus was the son of Constantine the Great (!) and died there (in Britain), and his grave is shown near a town which is named Cair Segeint (Caernarvon), as the letters on his tombstone testify'; the Irish version adds 'son of Helena', and the town is also said to be happy in having no poor in it, and to be called by another name, *Minmanton* ('quae alio nomine *Minantia*' is given in the Irish version). An

[1] On Helena consult Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, ii. 8; Orosius, *Historiae*, vii. 25. 16 'ex concubina Helena'; *Chronicon Paschale*, i. 517. 6, or the passages in which Ambrose makes much use of the term *stabularia* = hostess or landlady: 'Stabulariam hanc primo fuisse asserunt; Bona stabularia quae . . . Bona stabularia quae.' &c., in its many meanings; *De Obitu Theod.* 42; also the Panegyrics, vii and ix.

explanation of this strange statement is difficult, as the mention of an inscription on a gravestone seems to imply local knowledge. The name Helen still survives as a place-name near Caernarvon. Cair Segeint may be an error for Caer Costaint, meaning Constantinople, as some MSS. read *Cair Costain*, and Minmanton or Minantia is probably a similar scribal error for Byzantium.

CHAPTER VII

ERRONEOUS EARLY AND MEDIAEVAL VIEWS

When the throne of the Caesars was first occupied by a Christian, the Church's fortunes naturally underwent a fundamental change, but of this change practically no records are to be found in *British* writers. What few are found are misleading. Continental literary remains contain references to Britain, not because of her intrinsic importance among the nations of the world, but simply because this island was part of a great empire that was one from Mona to Edessa in Mesopotamia, from the Rhine to Alexandria and the upper Nile, from Gaul to the Provinces of Africa. Similarly there was one Church, with its communities in all these parts. No national Churches, as yet, existed but the Church *at* Rome, the Church *at* Alexandria or *at* Antioch, as, in the same sense, the Church *in* Gaul and *in* Britain, the Catholic Church in all places. The history of this Church in Britain became encrusted with new conceptions, which it is important for us to observe at the earliest possible point in our narrative.

For this purpose we shall here briefly review those features of our history which were accepted by British writers of the early and later Middle Ages, whose views were commonly accepted until a comparatively recent time. For this object the following list of sources may suffice:—

1. Gildas. This writer was a British monk of the monastery of Illtud, situated upon an island on the south coast of Wales, called in the British tongue Llanilltud. He was a companion of St. David, Samson, and others, by whom and by his own zeal he was led to write a kind of denunciatory address to his countrymen, both rulers and ecclesiastics, about A.D. 540. Its title is *De Excidio Britanniae.* After writing this work he followed the migration to Britanny, where his days were ended. Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, xiii. 1. I may also mention the edition published by the Cymmrodorion Society (London, 1901).

2. Beda, the historian of the English Church, brought this noblest of early histories to completion in A.D. 731. It is here quoted as *Historia Ecclesiastica* (Plummer's edition), or, as abbreviated, *H.E.* There has appeared an excellent revised translation of the History by Miss A. M. Sellar (1907). The *Chronica* was finished in A.D. 725; cf. Mommsen, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Chronica Minora*, xiii. 4.

3. Nennius. Under this name is known what may probably have been the work of two distinct authors. He speaks of himself as 'disciple of Elvodugus or Elbotus', Bishop of Bangor, who is styled 'Archbishop of Gwynedd'—Archescob Gwynedd—and whose death is approximately placed A.D. 800[1] (Mommsen's edition, pp. 126, 143, 207). He also calls the presbyter Beulan his *magister*, to whose son Samuel he addresses a number of verses (ibid. pp. 144, 152). Zimmer, in *Nennius Vindicatus*, concludes that the work in its earliest form was written by an unknown author in North Wales, about 679, as a continuation of the historical part of Gildas's *De Excidio*; supplementing him Nennius in 796 compiled the *Historia Britonum*. With this work of Dr. Zimmer should be compared *Nennius Retractatus* by M. Duchesne, which gives another text with notes, in the *Revue Celtique*, vol. xv. Thurneysen, reviewing Zimmer's work in the *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, xxviii, and more fully in the *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie*, i, made some additions to previous conclusions. He accepts the view that the first form of the work belongs to the year 679, but rightly concludes that it was amplified by Nennius about 826 in South East Wales.[2]

4. Geoffrey of Monmouth, Galfredus Monumetensis: *Historia Regum Britanniae*. Much of his life was spent as a deacon at Llandâv, but in February, 1152, he was ordained presbyter at Westminster, and in the same month, at Lambeth, Bishop of St. Asaph. The date of his

[1] *Brut y Tywysogion*, p. 258. Gwynedd, of course, is Venedota, or roughly North Wales, from the river Clwyd (or Conwy), including the present counties of Merioneth, Caernarvon, Anglesey, and, perhaps, parts of Denbighshire and Montgomery.

[2] The whole setting of the work connects it with this part. The fact that the author describes *Beulanus presbyter* as his master need not necessarily lead us to Anglesey, though there is a church in the island called *Llan Beulan*. We should have expected *Peulanus*, and there might have been several of the name. Neither do the wonders related of the Island of Mona in c. 75 lead us to connect the writer with Mona any more than with Ceredigion because of the previous section. The stone thrown into the whirlpool of Pwll keris(t) and found next morning safe in its accustomed home in the valley of Citheinn (Irish version Ciudenn), the inland ford where the water rises and falls at the same hours as the flood and ebb of the sea, are certainly wonders ('miracula') that smack of local knowledge, yet they, with others equally wonderful, belong to the *miracula Britanniae*.

death is unknown, but it must have been before 1154.[1] The Welsh translation of Geoffrey, *Brut Brenhined y Brytanyeit*, has been edited by Dr. Gwenogfryn Evans from the Red Book of Hergest (MS. of fourteenth century). It exists in different forms.

5. The Book of Llandâv, or Liber Landavensis, also edited by Dr. Gwenogfryn Evans, is a Chartulary of the Cathedral Church of Llandâv. The volume includes a collection of charters specifying gifts made to that church, of which some purport to be grants assigned to a date as early as the sixth century, reaching down to Urban, who was consecrated in 1107. These charters throughout regard Dubricius, Teliauus (Teilo), and Oudoceus (Eiddogwy ?) as the earliest bishops, and so the narrative begins its course in surroundings legendary, no doubt, but distinctly British. Besides the charters, the book also contains several Lives —those of Samson, Dubricius, Teilo, and Oudoceus.

As we examine the contents of these British records we find that Nennius (p. 164), Beda (*H. E.* i. 4), Geoffrey (iv. 19), and the *Book of Llandâv* (pp. 26, 68, 289), agree as to the evangelization of Britain through King Lucius about 176. They seem to borrow independently from the *Liber Pontificalis*, of which there must have been copies in Celtic Britain during the eighth and twelfth centuries. Some documents connect the beginning of Llandâv with Lucius, as the late Norman-French fragment in the *Book of Llandâv* shows (p. 313), but the book itself attributes it to Germanus and Lupus (p. 68). Two MSS. of Nennius add a British 'cognomen' to Lucius, i.e. *Leuer Maur*, signifying 'great light' ('magnus splendor'), but the Welsh *Brut* of Geoffrey has *Lles*, as a Welsh form of *Lucius*, which may have come through Norman-French; the addition *vab Coel* has nothing corresponding in the Latin. *Lles* as an equivalent of Lucius is, probably, older than *Lleufer*, which will compare with the similar attempt to furnish an interpretative name in *Morien* for Pelagius: had Lucius been retained free of French or Norman-French influence, as Dyfrig and Padrig, we should have had *Lug* or

[1] On the *Historia* see Hardy, Catalogue of Materials, vol. i, pp. 341–50; Sir F. Madden in *Journal of Archæol. Institute*, 1858, p. 305; Prof. W. Lewis Jones, of Bangor Univ. College, in *Transactions of Hon. Society of Cymmrodorion*; Dr. Sebastian Evans, *Geoffrey of Monmouth Translated*, pp. 329 ff. (1904).

Lig,[1] as the name of this mythical introducer of Christianity.

Nennius, with all his boasting of authorities—Hieronymus, Eusebius, Isidor, &c., made no reference to Arius or the Arian controversy. Gildas, having by him Rufinus's version of Eusebius and other Latin books, knew well the order in which to introduce his views respecting the Arian heresy—*Arriana perfidia*—and Beda followed him. Such were the authorities whose information respecting the introduction of Christianity through Eleuther and Lucius, the Diocletian persecution, and the martyrdom of St. Alban together with the men of Caerlleon, was *simply borrowed* by Geoffrey, the one writer whom nearly all subsequent ones have followed. We may confidently assume that Geoffrey had Gildas, Nennius, and Beda by him, employing his own imagination as he used their narratives with great freedom.

The real mediaeval history of Britain began with William of Malmesbury, who died in 1142, the date at which his *Gesta Regum* breaks off. Henry also, the Archdeacon of Huntingdon, in his *Historia Anglorum*, which deals with the period from B.C. 55 to A.D. 1154, so far as he touched on the history of the Church, derived his information in the same way from Beda; but to a slight extent, as will be mentioned presently, betrays acquaintance also with the work of Geoffrey of Monmouth, the contents of which came under his notice in 1139, or probably earlier, or personal intercourse with the author may account for the similarity. These two writers are named by Geoffrey in the last chapter of his *Historia*, but it is he rather than they who gave to British historiography its tendency until Henry VII's reign. Notwithstanding the strong terms in which William of Newburgh condemned 'the fancies and falsehoods' of Geoffrey, and the hardly disguised contempt with which Giraldus Cambrensis speaks of him in his *Descriptio Cambriae*, Geoffrey cast his spell over most writers until they were roused from their slumbers by Polydore Vergil in his *Anglica Historia*, written during the reign of Henry VII.

[1] A Welsh word corresponding to the English *dawn* or *break of day* is *Llug y dydd* = Latin *Lux*.

Let us now take a brief survey of the field of history as left by Geoffrey for those who came after him. His leading followers will be found among the writers of the St. Albans school, especially Roger of Wendover (1236) in the *Flores Historiarum*, and Matthew Paris (*c.* 1259) in his *Chronica Maiora*.[1]

Geoffrey of Monmouth—Galfredus Monumetensis—wrote his *Historia* about the year A.D. 1139. It purported to be a History of the Kings of Britain from 'Brutus the first king of the Britons to Cadwaladr son of Cadwallon', that is, from the fall of Troy to A.D. 689, the year to which he assigns (xii. 18) the death of Cadwaladr at Rome. The work was based, he says (i. 1), on a 'certain most ancient book in the British tongue', which Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, gave him, containing a chronological history of the successive *British* kings. The task of writing a history of *Welsh* kings, after Cadwaladr, he left to Caradoc of Llangarvan. That of *Saxon* kings he bequeathed to William of Malmesbury and Henry of Huntingdon. The two, however, were bidden to be silent as to the (earlier) Kings of Britain, 'because they have not that book in the British tongue which Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, conveyed hither from Britanny (*Britannia*), and which I have translated into Latin.' According to the *Brut*, it may be noted, Walter himself translated the book from Breton into Welsh, and it is from the latter language that Geoffrey made the Latin version. In this statement there may be an attempt on the part of the Welsh translator to cause his own work to appear as Geoffrey's original. The words stand at the end of the *Historia*, and these writers were Geoffrey's contemporaries. The earliest notice we possess of Geoffrey's work appears in a letter which Henry wrote to a friend whom he addressed as 'my best beloved Warin the Briton'. Henry was journeying to Rome in 1139 with Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, and found at the abbey of Bec in company

[1] I have used the Rolls Series edition of William of Malmesbury, Henry of Huntingdon, Roger and Matthew Paris (the two last may be read in English in Bohn's Antiquarian Library). For the Welsh *Brut* I have used Evans's edition; for Geoffrey himself, San Marte's.

with Robert of Torigni (one of the monks there) the *Historia* of Geoffrey. He made excerpts from it for his friend Warin. The work is supposed to have undergone some revision, with the result that Book vii, containing the *Prophecies of Merlin*, which had previously existed apart, was added about 1148. Geoffrey's name is first found, along with that of Walter the Archdeacon, as witness to the foundation charter of the abbey of Osney, near Oxford. There he signs himself 'Gaufridus Arthur', a form which must have suggested the Welsh 'Gruffydd ab Arthur'. The widespread popularity of this work is shown by the extent to which his narrative becomes part of history as given in the pages of later writers, and not only as the great fountain of romance in the stories of Merlin, Arthur, and the Holy Grail. The book gives us, for the period included in our previous pages, not history but a travesty of history, and to such an extent is this the case that no conclusion can safely be based upon any statement found in Geoffrey, except in those points where he has borrowed from Gildas, Nennius, or Beda.

Let us observe his methods. He has borrowed the account of the conversion of Britain by Lucius and Eleuteri Papa (the Bishop of Rome) from Nennius, or Beda or the *Liber Pontificalis*, but he has supplemented it by the interesting addition, that Eleuther sent over to Lucius 'two most religious doctors, Faganus and Duvianus (Ffagan and Dwyfan), who were to preach the incarnation of the Word of God, to wash him with holy baptism, and convert him to Christ': the whole island, he proceeds, was quickly converted to the faith, paganism disappeared, and its temples were converted into churches dedicated to God and His saints. These churches were filled with the various orders of the ministry. There were then, he asserts, in Britain, twenty-eight flamens and three arch-flamens. Instead of the flamens were installed the same number of bishops, and instead of the arch-flamens three archbishops, having their seats (*sedes*) in the three noble cities of London, York, and Caerlleon (*Urbs legionum*) on Usk. Subject to these were the twenty-eight bishops with their *parochiae*. The Metropolitan of York, according to

Geoffrey, had under him Deira and Albania, separated from Loegria by the river Humber; Loegria and Cornubia were subject to the Metropolitan of London; west of the Severn, 'Cambria, that is Gwalia,' was subject to Caerlleon. The bishops returned to Rome requesting confirmation by the Pope of all they had done, and this was duly granted (iv. 19, 20). Strange to say Geoffrey, though then resident at Llandâv or its neighbourhood, makes but one incidental mention of that Church or its pastors, because, to him, Dubricius was bishop, not of Llandâv, but of Caerlleon (viii. 12 and ix. 1, 3, 12). A certain Chelianus (?), 'illustris presbyter Landaviae,' is said by him to have succeeded Samson as Bishop of Dol in Britanny (ix. 15), but in the Welsh *Brut* the successor was Teilo, the Bishop of Llandâv. We read: 'Ac yn lle Samson archescob Llydaw, drwy anoc Howel uab Emyr Llydaw, y gossodet *Teilaw* escob Llandaf' (p. 204). Further, as Geoffrey in the Merlin (Welsh, Myrddin) prophecy predicted that Menevia should take the pallium of Kaerllion (*Urbs legionum*), the archiepiscopate will be there. We have throughout this, as elsewhere, evidences of the very different relations in which Geoffrey stood to the history of Llandâv as compared with those of the compiler of the *Liber Landavensis*. The author of the *Historia*, it may be inferred, could not be the compiler of that volume. Moreover, our best knowledge of the history of the Church at the time (about 167) must lead us to pronounce all this to be impossible as history: we have here simply the fictions of Geoffrey.

The same story of two 'legates' is, in substance, related by the compiler of the *Book of Llandâv*, p. 68, but with characteristic differences of detail. Here the emissaries are Eluanus and Meduuinus (Elfan and Medwy), not Ffagan and Dwyfan as in Geoffrey's book. Again, while the two are *doctores* and bishops (*antistites*) in Geoffrey's account, one—Elfan—is bishop, the other—Medwy—is *doctor*. A fragment printed in *The Cambro-British Saints* (p. 278), and Giraldus, in *De Iure et Statu Menev.* iii. 167, follow Geoffrey upon this point. The whole story reappears in the *Flores Historiarum* of Wendover and in the *Chronica Maiora* of Matthew Paris.

Further, Geoffey represents Lucius as now granting to the Churches of the faithful the possessions and territories that had belonged previously to the heathen temples. This in 167!

When Lucius died without heir, the Roman Senate sent the '*senator* Severus' to regain the island; he was resisted by a *dux* Fulgenius (Sulyen in the Welsh *Brut* = Sulgenius or Julianus), and was slain in battle. Of his two sons one, Geta, had a Roman mother, the other, Bassianus (i. e. Antoninus Caracalla), a British. The Romans made the former King of Britain, the Britons successfully supported the latter, and Geta was put to death. The next *king* of Britain was Carausius, who killed Bassianus; the Roman Senate again intervened, sending Allectus to Britain with three legions to suppress Carausius: Allectus was put to death by Asclepiodotus, the Duke of Cornwall, who in turn became *king*. Any one can see the strange confusion of what is here thrown together by the imagination of Geoffrey in his blundering attempt to get at 'kings of Britain'. History shows how in Geoffrey's work Commodus (180–92) was forgotten, though he had something to do with Britain in 184; so also were Pertinax and Pescennius Niger. Even Albinus, who was actually proclaimed emperor in Britain (196), was passed over, and the Emperor Severus appeared as a *senator* sent over by the Senate, and he did not even die at York; his two sons, who were born of the same mother, Julia Domna, were, according to Geoffrey, children of different mothers. Bassianus, who was also the Emperor Caracalla, must have reigned from 211 to 286 as 'King of Britain'. Carausius, who in Nennius (c. 24) is called *Karitius imperator et tyrannus*, was killed, not by Allectus his own officer, but by Allectus 'the legatus of the Roman Senate'. Asclepiodotus, instead of being Constantius's own praetorian prefect, is represented by Geoffrey to be *dux* of Cornubia (Cornwall), who, after triumphing over the Romans, places the crown, with the consent of the people of Britain, on his own head, 'to rule over his native country (*patriam*) with justice and peace for ten years.' It was during his reign that the Diocletian per-

secution broke out, when, as Geoffrey conjectures, St. Alban suffered. The account of the martyrdom is quoted almost verbatim from Gildas, but Geoffrey creates, out of his own head, a new saint and confessor who never existed, Amphibalus. The latter lived on in the histories, commemorated here on earth.

Against 'King Asclepiodotus' there arose Coel, Duke of Kaercolvin, *id est Colecestria*, upon whose accession to the throne the Roman Senate sent Constantius, a 'senator', to reduce the island. Coel and Constantius were able to come to terms, so that when the former shortly afterwards died, his beautiful and accomplished daughter Helena became the Roman 'senator's' wife. Their son was Constantine the Great. Constantius 'reigned' eleven years, and on his death at York 'gave the kingdom to his son', with whom as *rex Britanniae* a golden age was inaugurated—who also, soon after the victory over Maxentius near Rome, became 'sole monarch of the whole world'. Constantine, Geoffrey further relates, took with him to Rome three uncles of his mother Helena, that is to say, Leolinus, Trahern, and Marius, whom he promoted to senatorial rank. Meanwhile Octavius, *dux Wisseorum* (Eudaf iarll Ergig ac Ewas), had risen in insurrection and proclaimed himself king, and on his death it was recommended that his daughter should be given to *Maximianus senator* (Maxen Wledic). Now Leolinus, Constantine's British grand-uncle, was the father of this 'Maximianus senator', who was induced later on, by the advice of Caradoc *dux* of Cornubia, instead of carrying on his strife against 'the two emperors Gratian and Valentinian', to cross over and become King of Britain. This 'king', so falsely depicted, is really no other than the usurper Maximus 383, and, strangest of all, Theodosius the Great, the victor who annihilated him, by the decisive victory at Haemona (Laibach) in 388, is not once mentioned. We cannot but mark the utter confusion of events. Maximianus, who is really Maximus, though actually put to death at Aquileia, is made by Geoffrey to die at Rome. The Welsh *Brut* in three places gives to Maximianus Hercules, Maximianus (so named for

Maximus), and Maxentius, the same name—Maxen, though the second only is called Maxen Wledic.[1]

From this résumé of Geoffrey's narrative, where personages partly historical intermingle in imaginary positions with other personages wholly imaginary, and assigned to impossible times, we see how entirely futile is any recourse to Geoffrey's *Historia* for historical material, and with what circumspection it must be used. The part passed in review —the last chapters of Book iv and Book v—purports to give an account of the introduction of the Christian faith into Britain, but the organizations referred to and the relations with Eleuther, the *beatissimus Papa*, are historically improbable. The 'kings' of all this strange romance are presumably Christian princes (though this is not actually stated), for besides Dubric, David, and Samson, Guethelinus appears as Metropolitan of London in ch. ii of Book vi (Guelyn archesgob Llundein).[2]

Helen as the British princess, and the Christian mother of Constantine the Great, whom Constantius is represented as marrying on the death of her father Coel, the *dux* or Duke of Colchester, was a favourite with most of our writers in the Middle Ages. Even Henry of Huntingdon (the first, I believe, to relate it) must have been enamoured of the fact that a British princess was mother of Constantine the Great, and he adds also that she was called *Sancta*.[3] The following words in the Welsh *Brut*, not found in the Latin original, allude to the same fact: 'Sef oedd y henw Elen uerch Koel, a honno uu Elen luydawc,' while the

[1] Geoffrey, against the plainest history, makes Maximian come to Britain to carry out the Edict of Diocletian, when the *Brut* gives him this name, Maxen, p. 104. See pp. 109, 111, for the others.

[2] On Geoffrey's supposed sources see Hardy. 'These authorities, however, he distorts and amplifies without any scruple,' *Descriptive Catalogue*, i, p. 350. Geoffrey's acquaintance with Henry of Huntingdon and William of Malmesbury, *judged in the light of the contents of their own works*, seems to me to prove that Geoffrey, like them, knew the true lie of *Roman* history: his distorting and amplifying is far wider than the *Descriptive Catalogue* allows for.

[3] 'Accepitque filiam regis Brittanici de Colecestre, cui nomen erat Coel, scilicet Helenam, *quam Sanctam dicimus*.'

Latin is: 'duxitque filiam Coel, cui nomen erat Helena.'[1] Henceforth Helena, in Welsh Helen or Elen, found lasting memorials not only in vernacular records but in quite a number of place-names, such as *Sarn Helen*, the name given to many old roads, or parts of one great road, in the western districts of Wales. She remains Helen the Saint, but is indebted for her noble British extraction, as contrasted with Eutropius' statement respecting Constantinus, 'ex obscuriori matrimonio eius filius,' to the inventive genius of Geoffrey of Monmouth.

The *Historia* was soon translated into other languages, French, Welsh, and English. The Welsh version—also called *Brut y Brenhinoedd*—seems to have been made at some period probably later than the lifetime of Geoffrey himself. We have a half-century, more or less, during which it might have been produced. But what seems of some importance is that this Welsh version (there may have been more than one), which it is impossible to regard as the original 'old book in the British tongue' brought over by Walter of Oxford, seems to have come through a French medium, or was made by some one well versed in Norman-French.[2] Many forms of names suggest this conjecture, while many strange variations seem hardly compatible with the view that it is a version made directly from the Latin. I may mention the opening of ch. xiii in Book vi. The fact, however, of supreme importance is that Geoffrey's work in Latin, or the translations of it into French, Welsh or English, not only became the main source of a wide literature of Romance, but also left an inheritance of fictitious Church history, of the second, third, and fourth centuries, which the Middle Ages retained jealously: Lucius, or Lles ap Coel, is henceforth—with many additions in the Welsh Triads—for English and Welsh writers, the first convert to Christianity

[1] Is it possible that this adjective of the Welsh translator—*luydawc*—had at first a meaning in some way equivalent to *beata* or *sancta*? We have *lluydd* and Erin *luyddawg* in the Triads (Trioedd). *Myvyrian Archaeology*, Gee's edition, pp. 401, 402.

[2] Wace translated the *Historia* or *Brut* into French, but in metre, as early as 1155.

the idea of an archiepiscopate of Western Britain, first at Caerlleon on Usk, then at Menevia (Mynwy), or, by another fiction, at Llandâv through the appointment and consecration of Dubricius with the consent of king and people by Germanus, or by the consecration of Teilo at Jerusalem, also kept a firm place for ages. We know that the story of Lucius is at least older than Nennius and Beda. We do not know how far Geoffrey found the tales welded together in any native literature, either as prose or song, or as floating folk-lore, yet their acceptance for centuries as true history was due to him. Later on in his narrative, we know, he takes the names of the five *contemporary* princes against whom Gildas levelled his prophetic denunciations, and with strange liberty makes of them five *successive* Welsh princes!

My object is not to utter any depreciatory word of Geoffrey. He stands, and will stand, as a real master of his craft: all acknowledge the delight it is to read his pages, though not as history. 'The Middle Ages,' Lord Acton says, 'which possessed good writers of contemporary narrative, were careless and impatient of older fact. They became content to be deceived, to live in a twilight of fiction, under clouds of false witness, inventing according to convenience, and glad to welcome the forger and the cheat.' In the Notes he quotes the words of M. l'Abbé Duchesne, one of the ablest writers of the Roman Church: 'It is hardly before the second half of the seventeenth century that it becomes impossible to hold the authenticity of False Decretals, of Apostolic Constitutions, of Clementine Recognitions, of a false Ignatius, of a Pseudo-Dionysius, and the huge *fatras* of anonymous or pseudonymous works which made the bulk of the literary heritage of the authors most deserving of consideration larger by a third or a half.'[1]

The first rude shock in the treatment of our subject came in 1534, when Polydore Vergil published his *Anglica Historia*, in which he ruthlessly denounced Geoffrey and all his tales. For this he was bitterly assailed by several of our

[1] *Study of History*, by Lord Acton, p. 10; Notes, pp. 79, 80.

countrymen whose memory we have good cause to revere, such as John Leland, Sir John Price, Dr. Humphrey Llwyd of Foxhall, Dr. David Powell, and others. Nevertheless it was he, not they, who opened the right path to lead us away from the deceptive twilights and clouds of the Middle Ages. We now, somewhat regretfully, feel that we see less; but the atmosphere is clearer. The distant though more limited scene has become more definite.

CHAPTER VIII

CONSTANTINE AND BRITAIN

On the period to which we now turn the following may be consulted :—

Foremost—Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, viii. 13–15; ix. 9; x. 5–7; and the *Vita Constantini* by the same. Also Lactantius, or Pseudo-Lactantius, as he is now termed, in the *De Morte Persecutorum*.

Tillemont's *Histoire des Empereurs*, vol. v, is still the fullest répertoire of facts. Of the older writers who advanced very definite theories not creditable to Constantine, are Burkhardt, *Die Zeit Konstantins d. Grossen*, 1880, and Keim, *Der Uebertritt Konstantins d. Gr. zum Christenthum*, 1862. Wordsworth in *Dict. Chr. Biogr.*, and Boissier in *La Fin du Paganisme*, take a different view. Schultze, *Geschichte des Unterganges des gr.-röm. Heidentums*, ii, is full of suggestive points. Schiller, *Gesch. der römischen Kaiserzeit*, one feels to be particularly helpful. The *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* contains contributions by Schultze and Seeck, vols. xiv, xviii. Schultze's article in the *Realenc. für Pr. und K.*, 'Konstantin der Grosse,' fills in the gaps left by the above-named works.

Henry of Huntingdon calls Constantine 'the flower of Britain' (*Flos Britanniae*). We know how his meaning is obscured by a myth—that Constantine's mother was a British princess—yet the saying impresses us as we think of the young general proclaimed Augustus by the troops in Britain on August 25, 306. 'Thou fortunate Britain,' so speaks the panegyrist of Autun in 310, 'and now happier than all lands inasmuch as thou first sawest Constantine Caesar.'[1] One of the five or more British inscriptions of his time gives his name with ample fulness as *Imperator Caesar Flavius Valerius Constantinus pius felix invictus Augustus, divi Constanti pii Augusti filius.*[2] Though a son of Constantius, and acclaimed by the army of Britain as Augustus, he was

[1] 'O fortunata et nunc omnibus beatior terris Britannia, quae Constantinum Caesarem prima vidisti!' *Incertus Paneg.* vii. 9.

[2] *Corpus In. Lat.* vii. 1170, p. 211.

destined to be fettered in his actions by the disinclination of Galerius to accord him full recognition. Still we mark the great beginning: he who was to change the course of the world for long ages took the first step of the venture in this island. For six years his course was dark and difficult, for he held a dubious and only partially recognized position, until he decided upon the bold march against Rome, and at last the usurper Maxentius was conquered in the battle at the Milvian Bridge, on October 27, 312. In 306 he had formally and officially granted liberty of conscience to the Christians; on the march against Maxentius, or before, he had been converted and so entered Rome a Christian. Is it possible that Constantine had become a Christian before he left Britain for Gaul, where he had to defend his newly acquired dominions against incursions of Germanic tribes? To such a question no definite answer is possible. Much stress has been laid upon the heathen phrases found in some of the panegyrical orations addressed to him about A.D. 310 and 311, together with the absence of any mention of Christianity. These laudatory addresses, delivered by men who as a class were the very last to embrace the Christian faith, would be steeped in traditional forms, inherited from an ancient method of culture that could only be heathen. Old conventional phrases, with mention of the immortal gods, were looked upon as necessary adjuncts of such panegyrics publicly spoken in the emperor's own presence. They appear even in that of Pacatus addressed to Theodosius the Great, and Constantine, though himself a Christian, could have neither the desire nor the power to suppress them.[1]

Lactantius, writing about 314, speaks thus of Constantine: 'Upon receiving the imperial power, the first action of Constantine Augustus was to restore the Christians to their religion and their God. This was his first sanction of our

[1] Such expressions as in vii, 'Iove ipso dexteram porrigente: di immortales quando illum dabitis diem.' They appear in all, vi (307) and vii (310) especially, yea even in *Paneg.* ix delivered in 313, when all men must have known that Constantine was a Christian. The coins of that date, with their *soli invicto*, show a time when old and new ideas still lived on together.

holy religion reinstated.'[1] These words seem to imply the adoption of a new position, which was in advance of the merely tolerant policy of his father. Constantine's conversion need not be described as sudden, or as having political motives behind it. So far as his own words have been preserved for us to read in Eusebius's works, the History and the *Life of Constantine*, in Theodoret's History and in the *Codex Theodosianus*, we feel that they lead us to regard him as a sincere convert, with definite religious views. These views, no doubt, sometimes impress us as very superficial; yet history and experience furnish examples of others who have been proved to be strong and capable men of action, whether in the affairs of states or in the successful struggles of an active life on a lower level, and who, nevertheless, lived their earnest life with a very slender stock of Christian ideas. Julian, Constantine's own nephew, and Zosimus, both heathen, speak of him only as an enemy of the ancient religion. His simple religious conceptions could not lift him, we feel, to the idealism Duruy describes as his, nor was he capable of the scheming which Burckhardt ascribes to him.

From 306 to 312 Constantine was master of Gaul, Britain, and the territory of the Alps. Once during this period, in 310, he visited Britain, probably to suppress the northern tribes 'who dwelt on the sea', as Eusebius relates (*Vita Const.* i. 25); but early in the following year he was again in Gaul, and his name appears second along with that of Galerius and Licinius in the Toleration Edict issued by the former on April 30 of that year. Events moved rapidly after his departure from Gaul; he crossed the Alps, when the cities of North Italy, Sura, Turin, Brescia, Verona, fell one after the other into his power; he overcame Maxentius and entered Rome.[2] Then followed, at the end of the year, the

[1] 'Suscepto imperio Constantinus Augustus nihil egit prius quam Christianos cultui ac Deo suo reddere. Haec fuit prima eius sanctio sanctae religionis restitutae,' *De Morte Persec.* 24.

[2] The enthusiasm with which Constantine was received at Rome is described in *Paneg.* ix. 19 'te, Constantine, senatus populusque Romanus et illo die et aliis, quacunque progressus es, et ulnis ferre gestiuit. nec quidquam aliud homines diebus munerum aeternorumque

so-called Edict of Milan, which must have been published in Britain as elsewhere, in which religious freedom to all men is formally announced as henceforth the policy of the empire. We can imagine its being read, in the spring or summer, on the walls at Colchester, York, London, Deva, and Caerlleon on Usk.

This great enactment, new to Greek and Roman religions, new even in the history of mankind, was the outcome of a struggle inaugurated by Christianity itself; it secured to Christians full liberty for the future and reparation for the past. 'We grant,' it says, 'both to the Christians and to all men free authority to follow the religion which every man has chosen.' 'Not only the places of meeting,' it enacts in the second part, 'but other places also which the Christians are known to possess, being the property of their body, that is of their Churches, not of private persons, shall be, without any doubt or controversy, restored to the same Christians.' Thus ended the long warfare between the empire and Christianity.

We observe that the word 'clerics' (*clerici*), though in that very year used in other enactments and appearing frequently in the laws, is not found in this Edict; we observe also the significant recognition of an important fact, in that the term *body*, *corpus*, is employed as the equivalent of Church, *ecclesia* or *ecclesiae*. The Christians stood apart in the great empire, and they were regarded as having an organized existence which involved the possession of corporate property, no less than of a common faith. Now, as they entered into a new relation, of freedom and even of favour, they were a living society with a somewhat fixed constitution, the result of gradual growth during three centuries.

The Edict of Milan, considered as embodying a religious policy affecting heathen and Christians, was neutral in character; it secured for both perfect liberty in the exercise

ludorum quam te ipsum spectare voluerunt.' Also still stronger in x. 21: 'quis triumphus illustrior? quae species pulcrior? quae pompa felicior? dicam itaque, imperator, quo uno satis mihi videor divinam gloriam tuam significaturus.' See Schiller, *Die Kaiserzeit* (204), where we have a just estimate of Constantine's policy.

of religion. But as regards the Christians, all those who fell under a charge of heresy or schism were regarded as outside that 'body', for whose benefit the arrangements made by the famous Edict were provided. It must be confessed that the leaders of the Church itself acquiesced in this view as much as Constantine, so that it came about before many years had passed that persecution, in a new form, began afresh its baneful course of coercion in matters of faith and worship. It was necessary that the Church as a social body should have the power to exclude men from its communion, but it would be wrong not to notice this grave mistake on the part of its leaders which introduced religious coercion again into a pacified world. The new intolerance is Christian, but we have, under Constantine, only the beginning of it.

The Church had developed its constitution not by direct imitation of municipal and other institutions outside, though there might be many parallels in Judaism, but through its own aims and purposes, and so mainly with motives and impulses peculiar to its mission. Nevertheless, the form to which it had developed prepared the way for recognition by and material help from the empire; its power also to influence Roman legislation was greater than before, now that the emperor had become a Christian in faith and life.

The Christian community was a visible entity, and corresponded to the secular *civitas*, the bishop and the other clerics in each Church answering to the civic *curia*. Thus, though no State Church was established under Constantine, a *new relation* to the State came into existence—a relation of freedom, of favour, of predominance in the public life of the State, a relation which inevitably caused a Church so organized to become a State Church at a later period. The further parallel between the metropolitan in the Church and the *praeses* or *metropolitanus* of the province is not equally valid for this period, because in many parts, such as Illyricum, Gaul, and Spain, the office belongs to a considerably later date; probably in Britain it never existed.

Consequently the Christian community, in Britain as elsewhere, had a constitution—a constitution worked out

by itself, propagated by itself, though with great variations in the development of certain parts of its organism. It was important that there had been secured a victory over Montanism, notwithstanding its well-meant aim to reproduce a more primitive type of Christianity, because out of the victory came the progress which brings in an approximately settled form of Church life. In this settled form we have something which Constantine *found*, which he neither could nor would change.

The immense difference between East and West should not be forgotten. In large parts of Asia Minor the population had become almost entirely Christian; but in such a city as Alexandria the Church, though strong and numerous, was surrounded by a vast heathen population; the same would be true of Rome itself, in a sense the most intensely heathen of all cities, though political power and effective force in public life belonged to the Christians. Western Europe generally, the army especially, is represented as being still predominantly heathen, a dying heathenism however. The Church, consequently, cannot be regarded as strong in respect of numbers or communities at the beginning of this new period. 'In the army, in public offices, in learning, in the rural populations, there were only insignificant Christian minorities. The whole apparatus of the ancient religion in its hundredfold interlacings with life and the powerful priesthoods connected with the highest circles of society stood unbroken.'[1] Yet the Church was everywhere, and by the time we reach the reconciliations which led to and were formulated by the Council of Alexandria in 362, it is seen to have been endowed with a growing strength that was mightier than its own many embarrassments and stronger than the resistance of the vast heathenism amid which it lived.

It would be wrong to speak now of a Latin Church or even of a Greek Church: there was but one Church throughout the whole world, embracing men who spoke different languages, of whom some had for liturgic use and teaching Syriac, others Coptic, others Greek, others Latin forms. The faith

[1] Schultze, *Konstantin der Grosse.*

of this one Church, though it had its variations, was believed to be in substance the same in Britain and in Mesopotamia. Its organization also, in certain main features regarded as essentials, had grown along similar lines, although some countries lagged behind such central ancient communities as those of Rome, Antioch and Alexandria, in their development. In the main the term *bishop* (*episcopus*) would imply the same office and functions at York as in one of the cities or small towns of Italy, or in the small villages of Isauria in Cilicia.[1] The same might be said of presbyters and deacons. I may here quote the words of M. l'Abbé Duchesne, the learned French ecclesiastic, in his well-known work, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*:—

'The fourth century saw the last acts of this transformation, at least in respect of the popular masses in the towns. This vast development did not modify, except in a small degree, the hierarchic organism of the Churches. The number of ministers increased; certain changes, certain specializations of powers, followed; but the government remained monarchic; it even became more so. The presbyters continued to be the councillors, the supplementaries, the auxiliaries of the bishop; the deacons and other inferior ministers were occupied in temporal services, in charitable aid, in secondary details of worship.'

'At first there was no question of boundaries. . . . As Christianity spread in the cities and the country places, there was felt the need of determining where began, where ended the boundaries of each Church. The cities of the empire with their limits closely defined by their assessments, offered well-traced boundaries, against which no reason of a religious character could be raised. It was, generally speaking, admitted that every town (or city) should have its bishop, that its population must form a particular Church. . . . The city formed the general case, and the rule of a bishop for every city, or for an equivalent area, was applied almost everywhere in the fourth century and afterwards.'[2]

This, as M. Duchesne says, was the rule everywhere, and it remained so in substance until the Reformation, when what was held to be a return to primitive and scriptural

[1] See Basil, *Epistola*, 190, where he describes his efforts to persuade certain small villages to combine so as to have one good bishop in common; he failed, however, to secure this laudable step, because each of the petty villages had been accustomed to having its own bishop.

[2] *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, pp. 11–13. This work has appeared in English, published by the S. P. C. K. A similar account will, in fact, be found in Bingham.

ideas brought in such vast transformations.[1] The phrase in substance has been used because a modification in form was introduced by the gradual development of 'diocesan' episcopacy and the consequent care of single Churches by presbyters over whom, whether few or many, the bishop had rule and oversight. It may be difficult to trace the beginnings of this transformation: in large cities with several Churches we have one form of it, and it may have grown with very decided differences of extent. It is found, as the words of Athanasius himself attest, in the district of the Mareotis, with many Churches, in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, and Sulpicius Severus in his Epistola I on St. Martin gives evidence that the first monk-bishop of the West was, to some extent at least, also a diocesan bishop.[2] But this is a stage not developed in Britain.

[1] I do not mention those changes of administration due to the potent idea of Roman Primacy, such as that which the eleventh and twelfth centuries brought in.

[2] Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, c. 85. 'The district belongs to Alexandria, and there never was in it either bishop or chorepiscopus; all the Churches are subject to the Bishop of Alexandria.'

Ep. i. 'Cum ad dioecesim quandam pro solenni consuetudine, sicut episcopis visitare ecclesias suas moris est, media fere hyeme Martinus venisset . . .' Here *dioecesis* denotes a single community.

CHAPTER IX

THE COUNCIL OF ARLES

A Council of bishops accompanied by presbyters and deacons was held in the important city of Arles, summoned by Constantine himself, in A. D. 314. This was the first ecclesiastical gathering ever called together by a Roman emperor, and one of the letters of summons sent to the bishops of Western Europe has been preserved by Eusebius. The bishops were to travel to Arles at the public expense by the conveyance then provided for imperial officials, a favour which afterwards brought danger in its train. Each bishop was to choose two presbyters who would take part in the Synod (as the names of several are found among the signatures to the Acts) and three 'servants'.[1] Now there went to Arles at least three bishops from Britain. Their names have been preserved among those who subscribed the acts of the Council, along with those of one presbyter and one deacon. The Council included even exorcists from some Churches. From York, from London, and from Lincoln, bishops and presbyters went to sit in that first general Council. It is natural to ask why these British bishops sat in a Council held in a city of South Gaul; what they could have contributed to its deliberations, and what they might have brought home as rules or guidance for the future. The immediate cause of their being summoned was a difficulty which had arisen in

[1] Cf. Eusebius, *H. E.* x. 5. 21–4. There were *diaconi* at Arles, but the words of the letter are τρεῖς παῖδας. The letter given is that sent to Chrestus, Bishop of Syracuse; the others were in identical terms. The terms *Synod* and *Council*, it may be noted, are used synonymously. Synod is the Greek σύνοδος, and the Latin *Concilium* with the same meaning is found for the first time in the *De Ieiuniis*, c. 12, of Tertullian. Old British and Irish documents have *Sinodus*, *Senodus*, and the Welsh derived from it is *Senedd*, e. g. Senedd Vrevi.

the Church of Carthage in Proconsular Africa, but one which might precipitate a crisis endangering the peace of the Church at large.[1]

As out of the Decian persecution there had come a troublesome question of discipline in the case of 'the fallen' (*lapsi*), and a grievous schism—the Novatian,—so as a result of the Diocletian persecution divisions and troubles of like nature were rife in Alexandria, and especially in North Africa. Caecilian, in 311, was elected Bishop of Carthage. Caecilian (then deacon) and his predecessor Mensurius had been suspected of having compromised themselves during the persecution; they had shown, it was held, unworthy weakness; and the disaffection was increased because the ordination of Caecilian had been performed by Felix of Aptunga, a man suspected of having been a *traditor*. The opposition bishop, Donatus, and those called Donatists after him represented the stricter ideas in Church order and discipline. The Donatists appealed to Constantine, and Optatus of Mileva, their opponent, twits them with doing this; they who were accustomed to say: 'What have Christians to do with kings?' or, 'What concern have bishops with the royal palace?' They wrote to Constantine: 'We pray thee, Constantine, most noble emperor, as thou art of a righteous race, whose father among the other emperors had no part in the persecution, and because Gaul is free of this crime—in the contentions between us and the other bishops in Africa, we pray thee of thy piety to appoint us *judges from Gaul*.'[2] Constantine submitted the matter to a small Council or Committee of bishops at Rome under the presidency of Miltiades, the bishop. His letter to Miltiades has been preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* x. 5. 20), and shows how the emperor had been informed by Anulinus in Africa of the gravity of the case, the people being divided into two parties and the bishops disunited. The attempt of Con-

[1] Much of our information is derived from the work of Optatus of Mileva, *De Schismate Donativo*, and certain Letters (68, 166, 168) and Addresses of Augustine in his controversies with the Donatists of his own time (after 395).

[2] *Optatus Milevitanus*, i. 22. The letter was signed by several bishops, of whom five are named. Cf. Aug. *Ep.* 88; Migne, p. 302.

stantine, well meant as it was, failed. It was well arranged according to all ideas of the time, although the part played by him as the head of the State was new. That the Bishop of Rome, three bishops summoned from Gaul, as well as fifteen Italian bishops should 'by the command of the Emperor Constantine' sit to try a purely ecclesiastical case was entirely novel. It was the beginning of a great transformation which was, though very gradually, to develop in the future.[1]

The Donatists refused to acknowledge Caecilian; the state of civic affairs in Proconsular Africa was serious in the extreme, and Constantine became anxious. It was resolved, because the Donatists complained of the fewness of the bishops at Rome, to convene a Synod or Council at Arles (Arelate)—a Council of the whole West.

It would have been a great and difficult task to attempt the pacification of an important Church, covering three Provinces (Proconsular Africa, Mauretania, Numidia), and now divided into rival parties, each of which claimed to be 'Catholic'. One side, the *pars Donati*, was accused by the other of schism; Donatus in the phrase afterwards used by Augustine had raised altar against altar ('Donatus a Casis Nigris, qui altare contra altare . . . erexit'). The other, the Catholic, was charged with corrupting the Church at its source by allowing unworthy men to become its ministers. The two parties were orthodox, which aggravated the danger. Behind these divisions there were long-standing questions of differences in discipline, together with serious social irritations.

The names of the bishops from Britain and the two others who were present are given in Mansi from what is called the Corbey MS., as follows:—

1. Eborius episcopus de civitate Eboracensi provincia Britannia.

2. Restitutus episcopus de civitate Londinensi provincia suprascripta.

[1] Haupt, *Geschichte der röm. Kirche*, i. 392, refers to Aug. c. Petilianum, Can. 16, as confirming what may be seen in the letter to Miltiades; yet it is difficult, if not impossible, to agree with him when he speaks of Constantine as still being a heathen.

3. Adelfius episcopus de civitate Colonia Londinensium.

4. Exinde Sacerdos presbyter, Arminius diaconus.[1]

1. Eborius bishop of the city of York in the province of Britain.

2. Restitutus bishop of the city of London in the above-named province.

3. Adelfius bishop of the city in the *colonia* of Lincoln (Lindum).

4. From thence Sacerdos a presbyter, Arminius a deacon.

The name *Colonia Londinensium* has caused some difficulty, and *Colonia Legionensium* has been suggested as an alternative reading to imply that Adelfius came from Caerlleon on Usk, as Caerlleon in its older form is Caer legion, or, as is surmised, Castra legionum.[2] Now Isca, the Roman name for the camp, or Urbs legionum, besides not being a *colonia* such as Lindum (Lincoln), cannot supply such a reading; it is better to suppose a scribe's error, writing *Lond-* for *Lind-*, and that the correct reading was *Colonia Lindunensium*, that is Lincoln. The Latin name for the city, not the camp, of Caerlleon is always *Urbs Legionum* or *Civitas Legionum*, and such an adjectival form as *Legionensis* seems impossible, neither does the British *Caer* ever denote the *castra*, but the *urbs*, the *civitas* or city.

We observe that the three bishops are from important Roman stations, and that two of the names took root in the British tongue, Eborius becoming Ivor, and Restitutus Rystud (*Book of Llandâv*, pp. 316, 317, 320). But it is more important to notice that in Britain, as elsewhere, the usual three orders—episcopus, presbyter, diaconus—developed. As samples of other signatures I select the following from Mansi:—

Maternus episcopus Macrinus diaconus de civitate Agrippinensium.
Vocius episcopus Petulinus exorcista de civitate Lugdunensium.
Mansertinus episcopus Leontius diaconus de civitate Elosatium.

We thus see that exorcists, no less than deacons, presbyters, and bishops, had their share in the Council of Arles.

[1] Mansi, *Conciliorum nova et ampliss. Collectio*, ii. p. 476, new edition. Paris, Welter.

[2] Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. p. 7.

Some parts of the West may not have had experience of Councils previously, and in those held under Cyprian the people, as well as the clergy, attended, but it is curious to find exorcists, or even deacons, subscribing, as was the case at Arles. Before long the recognized members of Councils were bishops only, *but the freer and earlier usage continued in Britain.*

The Council, presided over by Marinus of Arles, decided against the Donatists. As the Bishop of Rome, who was now Silvester (Miltiades having died), was not present in person, but was represented by two presbyters and two deacons, the Council addressed him by letter, in terms of the highest reverence, requesting him to make their decisions known as far as possible to all ('Placuit autem a te, qui maiores dioeceses tenes, per te potissimum omnibus insinuari'). The Donatists were not satisfied, and the breach continued even in the time of Augustine. No one, in a few lines, can fix the blame fairly as between the two sides, but the almost reviling tone respecting the Donatists which Constantine adopted before the Council, and in connexion with the subsequent persecution of them, produced a very unpleasant impression. It was a bad beginning; enactments of this kind frequently failed to be carried out, or were repealed. The orthodox had before long to suffer a similar trial.

The point of real importance for us is to be sought in the twenty-two canons, which the Council, with members from Britain, Gaul, Italy, Spain, Germany and Africa, drew up to embody their views on other questions which, as in such cases as that decided already, or in the new position of the Church within the empire, might present difficulties from the point of view of ecclesiastical rule. Let us pass by the first for a moment, so as to gain from a few of the others some light upon the Church life of the time.

The canons, as the first of them and the superscription addressed to the Bishop of Rome imply, are regarded as binding upon the whole Church. Any one who reads the eighty-one canons of the Synod of Elvira (306), and compares them with those of the Synod of Arles, will be struck with this

difference: while the former deal with larger questions of organization and discipline, the latter, within narrower limits, touch mostly on points which would meet pastors of Churches in the ordinary course of their work. By 314 as compared with 306 the questions requiring notice and deliberation were fewer: the Church's position suggests that a wider and more uniform acceptance of settled usages had come to pass; on this account many points were not alluded to in the Canons of Arles. It may well be inferred that the absence of any reference to the metropolitan, in canons where such a reference might be expected, and exactly where it in fact occurs among the Canons of Nicea (325), proves that this system was in 314 not existent in Gaul, or in most of the other countries, including Britain, represented at Arles. Can. 20, for instance, prohibits ordination of bishops by one person, directing that seven ought to join in the act, in any case not fewer than three. Yet the important part assigned to the metropolitan in Can. 4 of Nicaea (in cases of ordination with three bishops present) and the proviso in Can. 6 (that no one is to become bishop without the knowledge and assent of the metropolitan) are absent.

Some of these canons show a consciousness of the change favourable to the Christians which had come over the empire.[1] Public life and probity in public life came under the recognition of the Church. The *praeses* of a British province, such as Britannia Prima, the country south of the Thames and the Bristol Channel, or Britannia Secunda, which corresponded roughly to our present principality of Wales, might, or might ere long, be a Christian; so also one or more of the *Clarissimi Consulares* in the other three provinces might be a Christian, so far as the provinces were

[1] Cf. Can. 56 of Elvira: 'Magistratus vero uno anno quo agit duumviratum, prohibendum placet, ut se ab ecclesia cohibeat,' with Arles Can. 7: 'De praesidibus qui fideles ad praesidatum prosiliunt placuit, ut cum promoti fuerint litteras accipiant ecclesiasticas communicatorias, ita tamen ut in quibuscumque locis gesserint, ab episcopo eiusdem loci cura illis agatur, et cum coeperint contra disciplinam agere, tum demum a communione excludantur. Similiter et de his qui rem publicam agere volunt.'

formed, and the canon throws some light on the attitude of the Church towards such officials of the empire.

The disciplinary attitude also of the Church towards her members is instructive, if we keep Britain in mind as we read. The rigour of the African Church was relaxed in the case of those baptized by heretics. When such a one comes to seek communion in the Church he is not to be re-baptized, if by his knowledge of the creed (*symbolum*) he show that he has been baptized in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit: in his case imposition of hands only is required (Can. 8). When a man's wife has been divorced on account of adultery, he should be counselled as strongly as possible not to marry another during the lifetime of the divorced wife (Can. 10). When young women marry heathen husbands they are to be debarred from communion for some time (Can. 11). Those who make a false accusation against a brother are not to communicate until they are about to die (Can. 14). If a man has been separated from communion, he is not to be admitted again except at the place where he was excluded (Can. 16). Two canons deal with excommunication; by Can. 4 those who take part as jockeys or grooms in the races held at the circus are to be excommunicated, so also, by Can. 5, are all actors on the stage in the theatre. The well-known obscenity and vice which in those times filled the circus and the stage explain the detestation in which they were then held by the Christians, and explain too the strictness of discipline manifested in these rules, as also in Can. 62 of the previous (Spanish) Council of Elvira (306), which enjoined on converted charioteers and pantomimists the abandonment of their callings. About nine canons throw light on the discipline of the clergy. 'Wherever men have been ordained as ministers, there they are to remain' (Can. 2)—an honoured rule, often quoted, often reimposed, as in Can. 15 of Nicaea and in the Apostolic Canons, but most transgressed, probably, of all! The clergy, it was further decided, were not to practise money-lending for usury, because their office is sacred (cf. Can. 12 = Elvira Can. 20 and Nicaea Can. 15); those

who had been guilty of giving up copies of the Scriptures, or sacred vessels, or had betrayed brethren by giving their names to the heathen, if proved guilty by formal trial, were to be deposed (Can. 13). One or two more canons may be noticed in this connexion as indicating the prevalence of certain ideas. Deacons, it is decided, are not 'to offer the sacrifice' (Can. 16), and bishops on travel should be allowed the opportunity 'to offer the sacrifice' in a strange city (Can. 19). It is difficult to give any other meaning to the word employed in these two canons, *offerre*, than that which implies that the Eucharist is regarded as, in some sense, a sacrifice, though the term *priest*, *sacerdos*, is not found here. More than half a century had passed since the death of Cyprian, in whose works this idea is so common, and these canons suggest that it may also have become familiar to British bishops at the beginning of the fourth century. The marked reference to the higher rank (*honor*) of presbyters over deacons in Can. 18 shows how complete the distinction in grade had become.

The Canons of the Council of Arles, when considered in this way, have a greater significance for us than the mere fact of the presence of British bishops in the Council; they picture the fashion of the Church's life in Britain.

To come to Can. 1, which is intimately connected with a British question, and on that account also deserves some notice. Though the conflict in Britain came later, the root of that British dissension was planted now. It has been maintained by some historians that the British bishops, notwithstanding their agreement with the Council's decision, went on as before observing a different rule, a rule which caused them to be regarded by the English Church at a later date as schismatics and severed from Catholic unity. A closer consideration of the situation leads us to a very different conclusion. The object of Can. 1 was to put an end to irritating differences in the time of observing Easter, differences which prevailed over a large part of the empire. Never before had there been such an opportunity as was afforded at this Council of Arles (where the West was so universally represented) of fixing a common rule. No

Church could equal Rome in influence, and *the Council seems to have adopted the custom of the Roman Church as that which all Churches should henceforth observe.* Thus was controversy, bred of uncertainty, to be ended. The British bishops brought this method of computation home, and the Church in Britain first, and Ireland afterwards, clung to it for the centuries during which rapid changes were taking place elsewhere. The eighty-four year cycle, which by Beda's time belonged to the *dubii circuli*,[1] and other determinations of days that followed it, came to Britain from the Council of Arles. Beda speaks hard words of the British. He cherished, I fear, hard feelings towards them, whereas their position was one of continued fidelity to this Council.[2]

The Council must have regarded an understanding on this subject as of prime importance with a view to universal agreement; it touched the reverence due to the Lord Himself, and might remove what had gravely compromised unity.

The first canon reads thus:

In the first place with respect to the observance of the Lord's Pascha[3] (it is decreed) that it be observed by us on one day, and at one time, throughout the world, and that thou (the Bishop of Rome) according to custom send letters unto all.

Primo loco de observatione paschae domini, ut uno die et uno tempore per omnem orbem a nobis observetur et iuxta consuetudinem litteras ad omnes tu dirigas.

All 'throughout the world' were not agreed that the feast should be kept on Sunday; hence it has been fitly argued that 'on one day' must mean on the same day of the week, i.e. on a Sunday. The position of the Council is frequently understood to imply that, while all are agreed as to the observance on a Sunday, the canon calls upon all

[1] Beda, *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 3, 4.

[2] *H. E.* ii. 12; iii. 25, &c.

[3] The Latin *pascha*, as a name for the great Jewish feast, borrowed from the Greek πάσχα, has been preserved in Welsh, Cornish and Armorican as *Pasc*, also in Irish, by a well-known change of the initial consonant, as *Casc*. The Roman languages naturally preserve it, as in the French *Pâques*, but the Teutonic languages have preferred another name, as in English *Easter*, German *Ostern*.

to observe *the same* Sunday. But this is secured in the second phrase *uno tempore*, since the question as to *which* Sunday arose out of want of uniform computation as to the *time when*, after the vernal equinox, Easter Sunday should fall. If that were made uniform all would naturally observe the same Sunday. The Council of Arles, it may be gathered, aimed at putting an absolute end to the observance of Easter on any day of the week but Sunday, though this had been already secured, if not in all, yet in the majority of Churches. How then are we to understand the second clause *at one time*? A full answer to this question would be intricate and long, requiring nice mathematical calculations, but some of the most significant points may be made plain.

(1) Easter Day, as a Christian festival, had become a commemoration of the Lord's Resurrection; therefore:

(2) This Sunday should be that on which a full moon occurred, or the next after;

(3) That full moon should be the first after the vernal equinox, or (when it so happened) the full moon that fell on the equinox itself, it being also Sunday. The Jews had always held their Passover or Pascha at the full moon, the 14th day of Nisan, on whatever day of the week it fell; so also had many Christian Churches observed 'the Pascha of the Lord'. Some Churches, even in Gaul itself, observed March 25, just as Christmas Day is now observed on December 25. But by our Can. 1 the observance was to be on a Sunday, as had been the custom from early times at Rome, at Alexandria, and other places. But the main point, *uno tempore*, still had to be decided.

Easter as a movable feast, its day being determined by the earliest full moon of spring, cannot fall on the same day of the solar year in any two successive years. The lunar year is eleven days shorter than the solar, so that, if the first day of the moon correspond to January 1 for any year, the moon will be twelve days old on January 1 of the following year. Many efforts had been made to find a common measure for the lunar and solar years when the same day of the moon falls or will fall on the same day of

the year a second time. This interval, which can never be quite exact, is called a cycle. A cycle of eighty-four years was introduced at Arles to determine the *uno tempore* of the first canon. The British bishops carried it home with them from the Council, and after long years it came to be regarded, though erroneously, as a sacred heritage which no stranger could induce the Church to abandon. Celtic ardour, which ran and runs into religious conservatism, and the sway of mystic ideas[1] aided the subsequent retention of this custom. When the next influx of Latin influence came, attended by the happy conversion of the English people, the Celtic Britons were styled non-catholic and schismatical because of their adherence to what they regarded as the holy Eastertide of their fathers.

The Arelate decree in Can. 1 as to *uno tempore* was a good attempt in the right direction, but since the Roman Church itself was wrong, and continued to be in the wrong until the very year (453, or more correctly 455) which we find holding the first place in the *Annales Cambriae*,[2] that is, until Leo I yielded to Alexandria, it was a decree that in practice did not make for unity. Rome had a defective system which the Council adopted, and the British were found, after long years, holding fast to this Roman method. Unwillingly yet wisely, Rome adopted the improved and superior tables of Alexandria; Britain clung to the Council of Arles.

This discussion of the deliberations at Arles, where at least three bishops, a presbyter, and a deacon from Britain were present,[3] may help us to form some idea of ecclesiastical

[1] See the *Epistola ad Leonem* of Columbanus, M. H. G., *Epistulae*, tom. iii, 156-60.

[2] On this point in the curious history of the *Annales Cambriae* see below.

[3] There *may* have been more, because the list of thirty-three episcopal signatures, found in MSS., can hardly be regarded as including all, and Constantine himself stated in his letter to Chrestus that he had 'commanded a great number of bishops from different and innumerable places to assemble at Arles' (Eusebius, *H. E.* x. 5, 21). Augustine's well-known words describing the Synod as 'plenarium ecclesiae universae concilium' (Migne, vol. ii, p. 169) are not such as to designate a gathering of

conceptions and usages which prevailed at that time, or came to prevail, in our own island as in other countries.

EXCURSUS C

On the Observation of Easter until the Council of Arles.

On this subject may be read:

Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticae*, vol. ix, pp. 254 ff.

Smith, *Dict. of Christian Antiquities.*

Duchesne, *Origines du Culte chrétien*, ch. viii.

Preuschen, in *Realencyklopädie*, vol. xiv, pp. 725-50 (3rd edition), and Drews, *ibid.*

Burn, in his edition of *Niceta of Remesiana.*

Franz Rühl, *Chronologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit.*

Joseph Schmid, *Die Osterfestberechnung in der abendländischen Kirche.*

Ideler, *Handbuch der mathem. und techn. Chronologie*, 1826; *Chronicon Paschale*, Bonnae, 1832, esp. pp. 13 ff.

De Morgan, *Easter Day.* Nothing more lucid could be read than this account of the mathematical questions that enter into the discussion. It was prepared for the 'Irish Prayer Book of the Ecclesiastical Society' (1844-5). My copy is in *A Budget of Paradoxes*, p. 219 (1872).

Days of fast and festival appeared early; they soon acquired no small significance for the religious life of Christians in all parts. Besides the Lord's day as a day of joy, Wednesday and Friday had a sterner and more serious meaning: Wednesday as the day when the Jewish Sanhedrim decided upon putting Jesus to death (Matt. xxvi. 3 f.) and Friday as the day on which He died; these became weekly fast days and days of public worship.

It may be said generally that down to A.D. 200 no celebration of Christmas Day on December 25 had yet appeared, nor was the older Epiphany on January 6 observed to commemorate the birth of the Saviour. Of Easter and Pentecost as annual feast days of Christians we certainly find copious evidence. No intimation of the observance of any Christian annual days is found in the New Testament, nor is any beginning of such observances traceable in sub-apostolic times. Probably there never

thirty-three bishops. Yet the actually ascertained distribution of these would make it in a fair sense representative of the West.

was any such beginning: the Jewish Christians would continue their old feasts, and particularly that of the *Pascha* or Passover, giving it at the same time a Christian signification. Their Gentile brethren would soon follow. About A.D. 200 Easter is everywhere observed, though in very different fashions as to time and ritual. The difference as to time continued long; it is to be found not only in the East but in Gaul as late as the lifetime of Gregory of Tours, and in the British Isles until the eighth and ninth centuries. Heated controversies arose in Britain respecting this difference, from the time when Augustine of Canterbury met the British in that conference under The Oak. Though it is not easy for us to understand the bitterness and disunion, the wars, excommunications, and depositions, which followed the clash of different views, they had a natural origin in the past history and the conversion of various nations. There was, we realize, something deeper than a striving for power; there were elements in the controversies which touched the holiest feelings of men, though the disputants were seldom capable of understanding the real facts, which facts ought to have restrained their bitterness against others.

About the years A.D. 192–4 we approach the most significant fact in the early stage of this controversy. Victor, the Bishop of Rome, attempted to exclude the Churches of Asia and the neighbouring Churches from communion. This measure, judging by the order of Eusebius's narrative, arose in consequence of the intervention of Polycrates of Ephesus, who defended the old usage in Asia of observing the fourteenth day of the moon—the fourteenth Nisan of the Jews—by an appeal to Philip and his two virgin daughters and another daughter (endowed as they were with the spirit of prophecy), to the apostle John, to Polycarp and to others. 'All these,' he says, 'observed the fourteenth day.' Bishop Victor pronounced the Churches who observed such a custom as guilty of heterodoxy (*ὡς ἂν ἑτεροδοξούσας*). The Churches of Pontus, of Gaul and of Osrhoene sided with Rome on the question in dispute. Nevertheless the leading bishop in Gaul, Irenaeus of Lyon, deprecated the measures taken by the Bishop of Rome, and in the letter addressed by him to Victor gives us a larger view of the difference which caused to many such anxiety of soul. There is more involved, he observes, than the question of the day. There was—this we learn from the same chapter in Eusebius—a difference as to the time when Christians ought to end their fast—one day, two days, or forty

hours of fasting—and celebrate (ἐπιτελεῖν) 'the mystery of the Lord's Resurrection': the fourteenth was the day on which the fast ended and a commemoration of the Resurrection followed—the fourteenth, *whatever day of the week it might be.* Irenaeus could not see in these differences any case of heterodoxy such as Victor had condemned, and cited the beautiful example of forbearance shown by Polycarp and Anicetus when the former had come from Smyrna to Rome about A.D. 154.[1] The Eastern leaders kept their few days of fast, ending the same on the fourteenth day of the vernal moon, until the end of the second century; the custom no doubt continued longer. Rome, on the other hand, held that Easter, the Lord's Pascha, ought to be celebrated on Sunday, the Resurrection day, though this should carry it beyond the ancient fourteenth day. As yet, that is about the time of Victor (189–198), of Irenaeus (*c.* 185), as well as of Tertullian (*c.* 195–222), there does not seem to have been any rule fixed which would determine the day for the observance of Easter. Those of Asia (proconsular) continued to take their fourteenth day of the moon at the vernal equinox from the Jews; Rome, and the other countries named above, continued to connect their idea of Easter observance with the equinox and the full moon, but fixed it on the Sunday following these. The time of the equinox itself varied; in some places it was March 25, in others the nineteenth, and in others the twenty-first. Between the Quartadecimans and those who followed the Roman Church, the Churches of Palestine and the Church of Alexandria *took a middle course* of their own. Alexandria soon began a new method of fixing a term (*terminus*) and a cycle for the Christian Easter Sunday, so that it should always take place after the vernal equinox and as a feast of the Resurrection. The average solar or Julian year of 365 days 6 hours is too long by eleven minutes and ten seconds, neither can it after any fixed number of repetitions be exactly coterminous with the lunar year, or as it is also called, the synodical year: there is no exact common measure for the two. We learn from Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 20, that Dionysius of Alexandria had determined upon a cycle of eight years for the issue about A.D. 264 of his Paschal

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 23 and 24. Eusebius gives these facts fully in copious extracts from the decisions of the Council held at Laodicea *c.* A.D. 170, from the letters of Polycrates, Victor and Irenaeus, also from the letter of the bishops of Palestine.

Letters.[1] This, however, was abandoned as rude and unsuitable. Then a learned mathematician of Alexandria, Anatolius by name, introduced the old Attic cycle of nineteen years, which, used at Athens since 432 B.C., had formed the basis of the Athenian calendar, as well as of those of other Greek states. This proved suitable for the use of the Church, and eventually all Churches followed the Alexandrian calculation with some modifications.[2]

Alexandria was slowly leading the way towards agreement, yet at the time when the celebration of Easter first came to Britain—about A. D. 180–200—there could have been no fixed rule respecting the time of its observance.

At Rome Hippolytus (217–235), as Eusebius testifies, wrote a work on Easter (*τὸ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα σύγγραμμα*)[3] which gives a table based on a sixteen years' cycle. It soon proved unworkable. In Africa there was current a *De Pascha Computus* which followed the table of Hippolytus. This was the state of things in the West about A.D. 250. We now come to a point and a work

[1] Eusebius, *H. E.* vii. 20 *κανόνα ὀκταετηρίδος*, but always *μετὰ τὴν ἰσημερίαν*.

[2] It is found that nineteen solar years nearly = 235 lunar months, the difference being slightly more than two hours, which in twelve of these cycles would amount to a whole day. Put in the form of a table they would stand as follows:—

19 average Julian years amount to 6,939 days 18 hours.
235 ,, lunar months ,, 6,939 ,, 16 ,, 31 mins.

Anatolius placed the new moon of the first month in the first year of his cycle on March 22, so that the Easter *terminus* would fall on April 4. His table, it has been calculated, began with A. D. 277. But his equinox was March 19, which afterwards was changed to March 21 (a fragment from the work of Anatolius is given by Eusebius, Book vii. 32. 14). Afterwards Tables were prepared by Theophilus, Anianus, and Cyrillus. Theophilus is believed to have begun his work at the command of Theodosius the Great, owing to the divergence of calculation between Rome and Alexandria for the year 387, when Rome celebrated Easter on March 21, but Alexandria on April 25. These differences continued to occur for a long time, furnishing a source of no small irritation between East and West. It was Alexandria, however, with its superior science, that finally prevailed.

[3] Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 22; cf. also Jerome, *De Viris Ill.* 61. Somewhat more is known from the evidence of the inscription on his statue, discovered between Rome and Tivoli in 1551. Ruhl's *Chronologie*, p. 119; *Ideler*, ii, p. 213.

The *De Pascha Computus* is printed in Hartel's Cyprian, *Appendix*, pp. 248 ff. It is the work of some anonymous writer, and furnishes its own date, A. D. 243.

which touches our island: a computation based on a cycle of eighty-four years and called the *Laterculus of Augustalis* was drawn up to cover the years A.D. 213–312. Augustalis, with this cycle,[1] seems to have succeeded in producing a method of computing which was somewhat widely accepted in the provinces. In 312 it received the formal acceptance of the Church of Rome, and continued to exhibit, with slight modifications, its official calendar until 342. These modifications produced the older *Supputatio Romana*, which is known by ingenious calculations from a Roman State calendar, the work of the so-called chronographer of 354, which gives the Easter feasts from 312 to 342.[2] *It was this computation which the British bishops carried home with them from Arles in* 314, in accordance with Can. 1 of that Council, and in accordance with the letter addressed to the Bishop of Rome.

As the basis of the Roman reckoning, we have the cycle of eighty-four years, the earliest day for Easter being March 25, the latest April 21; as a computation it has some slight differences when compared with that of Augustalis. It agrees, nevertheless, with the method employed in Britain and Ireland, when Augustine of Canterbury held his conference with the British bishops. As we have seen, there was no beaten road of a general understanding here, but different countries followed usages of their own. There were even in the same country, in Gaul for instance, divergences among the Churches, and the Council of Arles, in Can. 1, was the earliest attempt in the West to put an end to such a confusion. Easter henceforth was to be observed on the same day (of the week) and at the same time (of the year) throughout the world, and the Bishop of Rome was to make the computation known to all Churches. The decision arrived in Britain and remained long. Beda, therefore, was not quite correct when in 731 he wrote that no one had brought to the Britons 'synodalia paschalis observantiae decreta' (*H. E.* iii. 4).

[1] An eighty-four year cycle (Julian Calendar) has 30,681 days; its 1,039 moon months give 30,682 days 6 hours 48 mins., thus having a difference of $1\frac{1}{4}$ days, instead of the one hour and a half of the Alexandrian (Metonic) nineteen-year cycle. It has, nevertheless, some advantages.

[2] It has been edited by Mommsen with fullest material for elucidation in vol. ix of the *Monumenta Germaniae Hist.*; *Chronica Minora*, i, pp. 13 ff. This calendar has far wider interest, of course, than the list of Easter days embodied in it; it shows also some curious instances of a mixture of heathen superstitious ideas and Christian facts; the former have, some of them, been heard of by many middle-aged people now living.

CHAPTER X

THE FAITH OF NICAEA

The Church's victory over the Gnostics anticipated its victory during this fourth century over the Arianism which tended to fasten the heathen conception of a demigod upon Christian thought. 'If Christ is the full and final revelation of the Father, God is not unknown or unrelated to us, and the Son must have His origin in no creative will, but in the inmost nature of the Eternal. This is the meaning of the Nicene decision, and this is all that Athanasius really cared for. . . . The Christian doctrine of the Person of Christ can be stated simply enough—that He is as divine as the Father, and as human as ourselves . . . this means all that Athanasius ever meant.'[1] As this question, inevitably forced upon the notice of Christians, was not settled for all parts at Nicaea, the doctrine itself as approved of at the Council came at certain points to touch the Church in Britain. We have no information as to any share being taken by Britons either in the Council or in the subsequent conflict during the early years of the controversy. Eusebius, who was a leading member of the great gathering, says there were over 250 bishops present; Athanasius mentions 'about 300', and in his *Epistola ad Afros* puts the number at 318, which is the generally accepted figure. Yet of all these there were only seven from the West, those of the furthest west being Hosius of Cordova and Nicasius of Dijon. There was probably no controversy in Italy, Gaul, or Britain until the fifties of the century, while the fact that the phraseology was already familiar to them through the writings of Tertullian, Novatian, and especially

[1] Prof. Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God and its Historical Development* (Gifford Lecture), vol. ii, p. 111.

Dionysius of Rome,[1] rendered it easy for Western Churches who used the Latin tongue to accept the faith as formulated at Nicaea.

The only mention of Britain in this connexion is indeed not in harmony with what has been just said, though it is made by our native writer Gildas. 'For this sweet harmony between Christ the head and the members continued until the Arian unbelief, fierce as a snake vomiting forth its over-sea poison upon us, caused deadly separation between brethren dwelling together.'[2] Gildas, however, is vague and indeterminate here because his statement respecting 'this sweet harmony' disturbed by the *Arriana perfidia* seems to convey a general impression derived from his reading of Rufinus's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, a book from which he quotes in cc. 74, 75, and of the *Chronicle* of Jerome, from whose writings he makes several quotations. He speaks of the heresy as a poison coming over sea, *transmarina venena*, by which is implied that it came from Gaul; but Gaul, we know, was orthodox. Besides, we have testimony, though meagre, from the writings of Athanasius, respecting Britain and its position in the controversy. In each case Britain and Gaul are named together. Writing, about 351, his *Defence against the Arians* (*Apologia contra Arianos*) he relates in the Introduction the sentence passed in his favour at the Council of Sardica (343), where he had the suffrages of more than 300 bishops 'from the provinces of Egypt . . . Gaul and Britain'. The list given in c. 50 does not add the name of the Churches from which these bishops came, nor does Hilary's record, although it supplies the names of Churches, mention any in Britain. This list, however, is very corrupt in parts.[3] In some way it was

[1] See Athanasius, *De Sententia Dionysii*, in reference to the correspondence between the two Dionysii.

[2] *De Exc. Brit.* 12 'Mansit namque haec Christi capitis membrorumque consonantia suavis, donec Arriana perfidia, atrox ceu anguis, transmarina nobis evomens venena fratres in unum habitantes exitiabiliter faceret seiungi'.

[3] On these and other lists the fullest account obtainable is that of the brothers Ballerini printed in Migne, tome 56, vol. iii of *Opera Leonis*,

known to Athanasius that Gaul and Britain were on his side. After Sardica he could name subscriptions up to 400, and among these, he again says, 'there were bishops from Rome and all Italy . . . those from Gaul, Britain and Spain, &c., &c., . . .'[1] Similarly, letter 56 to Jovian, written in 363 after the death of Julian, names the Churches that assented to the faith of Nicaea, viz. 'those in Spain, Britain and the Gauls, &c., &c.'[2] Even meagre notices of this kind ought not to be passed over lightly, since they convey to us reliable intimations that the great controversy was being followed and watched by some in Gaul and Britain who took the same view as Athanasius. There may have been opponents also.

After the death of Constantine in 337 the empire was divided between his three sons, the westernmost part (including Britain, Gaul, and Spain) falling to Constantine II, the eastern portion to Constantius II, while Constans held the middle, Greece, Illyria, Italy, and Africa. Between February and April, 340, Constantine II was killed in battle, and his territory was seized by his brother Constans. Events of the greatest importance for the history of the Church filled the interval between the death of Constantine and that of Constans, so well known as the friend of Athanasius in his exile. We have, nevertheless, nothing to relate concerning Britain during this period. Britain's part in the Nicene controversy when it had come to be a series of personal charges, chiefly against Athanasius, though the motive of attack was doctrinal, was limited to what has already been mentioned in connexion with the Council of Sardica (343) and the subsequent proceedings.

Athanasius ended his second exile in 346, when the most happy, most free, and most strenuously active term of his life began, lasting about ten years. These years bring Britain again under notice. In the insurrection led by Flavius Magnus Magnentius, the Finance minister,

col. 54-64. See also Robertson's note in the English edition of Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar.* 50, p. 147.

[1] *Historia Arianorum*, 28; Migne, i, col. 725.

[2] *Ep. ad Iovianum* 2; Migne, ii, col. 816; Robertson, p. 562.

Constans was killed. The news of his death and of the insurrection led by Magnentius in 350 brought Constantius from his campaign against the Persians to the West. During the winter of 350–1 he was quartered at Sirmium, a city on the river Save, a tributary of the Danube, with the intention of advancing against Magnentius. On September 28 the usurper was defeated at the great battle of Mursa, which compelled him, after other reverses, to retreat to Gaul, whither he was slowly followed by Constantius. The end came at Lyon (*Lugdunum*) in August, 353. Successful over the dead Magnentius, the Emperor Constantius now turned against Athanasius, 'an enemy more odious to him,' as Gibbon says, 'than the vanquished tyrant of Gaul.' When Constantius spent the first winter at Sirmium there were with him about twenty-two bishops of the Arianizing court party, who had followed him from the East. A Synod was held there some time in 351, and the first of a series of new creeds intended to influence the West was published. This is the so-called First Sirmian Creed.[1] But when Constantius had reached Lyon (*Lugdunum*), and afterwards Arles, he invited, that is to say, he summoned Athanasius to attend there; Liberius, Bishop of Rome, also called him to Rome, but Athanasius warily evaded both messages. In the Synods held at Arles and afterwards at Milan (355) Constantius, who, unlike his father, was as much a theologian as any bishop, was found carrying out the project he had formed as early as his first winter at Sirmium, a project of terrorizing the West into slackening its adherence to the Nicene faith by renouncing Athanasius, its chief representative and champion. There was partial compliance, but a number of men, in defiance of the brute violence of arbitrary authority, refused to sacrifice their liberty and independence in matters of faith, and were banished. Of these were Paulinus of Trier, Dionysius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, and, chiefest of all, Hilary of Poitiers. Hosius of Cordova and Liberius of Rome were compelled to follow. We refer to this reign

[1] The Creed is found in Hahn's *Bibliothek*, p. 196; a full discussion of its meaning and date in Gwatkin's *Studies in Arianism*, p. 149.

of terror in matters of religion in Gaul with the special object of coming to Hilary of Poitiers, a man who, it has been said, 'was a match for Athanasius himself in depth of earnestness and massive strength of intellect'; for he will bring us into touch with Britain. The violent measures which were carried out in Gaul, and which for a time made the oriental Arianizing party victorious, would seem to have been extended to this island as well. Such a course was natural. Under coercion the deposition of Athanasius was passed, and when the general Syagrius with ugly bloodshed carried it into execution in the Church of Theonas, Athanasius retired to the desert, whence he was still, though invisible, the master of Egypt, and through Egypt ruler of the West.

Constantius returned to the more eastern parts of his empire in the second half of 357: he was at Sirmium some part of the time and during the winter of 358; finally leaving that place for Constantinople, he reached Persia in May, 359. Now was issued the Second Sirmian Creed to which Hilary gave the name of *Blasphemia*. The formula was aggressive, and soon proved to be a turning-point in the controversy by creating new parties which drew near to the old Nicene section. They were unable to accept the now old term 'of the same essence' (*homousion*, ὁμοούσιον), but were willing to use another 'of like essence' (*homoeusion*, ὁμοιούσιον) with almost the same meaning for them. Others again spoke of the Son as being 'like in all things' unto the Father. A formula intended to be broad and colourless was soon (358) published at Sirmium, known to us as the Third Sirmian Creed. The period was one of great confusion. But a decision was arrived at to hold a general Council in the hope of sheltering the Arians, and of making an impression upon the Homoeans in their present disposition of inclining towards the Nicenes. The idea of holding the Council at one place was abandoned; then two places were fixed upon, Seleucia in Isauria for the East, Ariminum (Rimini) in Italy for the West. However, before Constantius had left Sirmium for Constantinople a creed was agreed upon which should be submitted to these Councils, the

Fourth Sirmian Creed, or, as it was mockingly called, 'The Dated Creed.' With all the appearance of an imperial decree issued by authority, it was dated May 22, 359. When placed before the bishops of the West at Ariminum (July, 359), where from 300 to 400 had assembled, of whom about eighty proved to be Arians, it was met by strong opposition, but by a series of frauds and by artful management the Council, after long delay, was driven to the appearance of accepting a slightly modified form of it.

We go back a twelvemonth. Hilary in his exile had frequent correspondence respecting the affairs of the Church in Gaul, and, apparently, in Britain as well. The letters expected from Gaul in 358 were long in coming, but, to his great joy, about the end of that year a long-detained correspondence reached him. In it the bishops of Gaul, *and those of Britain*, as the answer proves, informed him that they had repudiated 'the confession drawn up at Sirmium', that is, the Second Creed (of 357), so that Hilary had, he declared, in their letter and in their actions generally, 'witness of the uninterrupted independence and security of their faith.' 'Some of you whose letters have reached me,' he goes on, 'have expressed a wish that I, unfit as I am, should notify to you what the Easterns have said since in their confessions of faith.' Late in 358, or early in 359, complying with this request, he sent them the treatise *On the Councils* (*De Synodis*). It is addressed thus:—

> To the most dearly beloved and blessed brethren our fellow bishops of the province of Germania Prima and Germania Secunda, Belgica Prima and Belgica Secunda, Lugdunensis Prima and Lugdunensis Secunda, and the province of Aquitania, and the province of Novempopulana, and to the people and clergy of Tolosa in the Provincia Narbonensis, *and to the bishops of the provinces of Britain*, Hilary, the servant of Christ, (prays for) eternal salvation in God our Lord.[1]

'The laity and clergy of Toulouse (Tolosa)' are specially named, probably because their bishop Rhodanius had been

[1] Migne, *Hilarii Opp.* ii, col. 479. Engl. Tr. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. ix, p. 4.

banished, like Hilary himself, by Constantius.[1] But why was a circular letter, such as the *De Synodis* must be, addressed also to 'the bishops of the provinces of Britain'? Britain, it would seem, as well as Gaul, had interest in this exiled bishop, had joined in letters sent to him, probably also had contributed some of the money remitted for his needs; men from Britain may have been among the deputies who from almost all the provinces visited the exiles.[2] Gaul and Britain are shown to be closely connected both in their opposition to the tyrannous interference of the emperor and in their steadfastness in holding the faith. This close relationship appears again and again.

Gaul itself soon came into closer contact with the richer literature of the Eastern Church and with its freer, livelier teaching, in which Britain and Ireland also seem to have shared. The *De Synodis* itself initiated a not unimportant epoch of acquaintance with Greek religious thought: it must have impressed them as very new; it exhibits a rare combination of fair-minded comprehensiveness with tenaciously close thinking, and a spirit, very rare then, of conciliation towards unpopular formularies permeates it. We are glad to think of such a work being read in 'the provinces of Britain'. It was written before the 'Dated Creed' had been drawn up, at a time when the idea of holding a general Council which should tolerate some form of Arianism had not been conceived. Its contents therefore were known in Britain as well as in Gaul before the Council met at Ariminum (May, 359).

'The emperor ordered a synod to assemble at Ariminum, a city of Italy, and instructed Taurus the prefect not to let them depart, after they were once assembled, until they agreed to one faith, at the same time promising him the consulship, if he carried the affair to a successful termination.' This account of imperial tactics in matters

[1] Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica*, ii. 39, written forty-five years afterwards, *abhinc annos quinque et xl*, Halm, p. 98.

[2] Hilary, *De Syn.* 'Ceterum exules satis constat totius orbis studiis celebratos, pecuniasque eis in sumptum affatim congestas, legationibusque eos plebis catholicae ex omnibus fere frequentatos.'

of faith is from Sulpicius Severus, who also finds one fact specially 'worthy of mention'. It relates to three British bishops. When 400 or more Western bishops, 'by invitation or compulsion,' met at Ariminum, they found that the emperor had ordered provisions and lodgings to be prepared for them. 'But that appeared unseemly,' Sulpicius continues, 'to the men of our part of the world, that is, to the Aquitanians, the Gauls, *and the Britons*, so that, refusing the supplies made at the public cost, they preferred to live at their own expense.' There were three from Britain, however, who, because they lacked private means, made use of the public bounty, refusing contributions offered them by the rest, 'for they thought it more proper to burden the public treasury than individuals.' The incident, we gather from the next words of the historian's, must have furnished a topic for discussion in Aquitaine: 'I have heard that Gavidius, our bishop, was accustomed to refer to this conduct in a censuring sort of way, but I should be inclined to judge far otherwise.' The judgement of Sulpicius is influenced by ascetic ideals. Here is a clear intimation of the cleavage made in a short interval of time, for Sulpicius was writing forty years later, and by that time, like his intimate friend Paulinus of Nola, another Aquitanian, he had become a monk, to whom ascetic abstinence with voluntary poverty was the most perfect life. This was an idea of life with which the British bishops at Ariminum, though choosing an honourable poverty, had not yet become acquainted, and which was probably not favoured by Bishop Gavidius. Thus Sulpicius proceeds: 'I hold a very different opinion, regarding it as a matter of admiration that the bishops were so poor that they had nothing of their own, while they would accept assistance from the public treasury rather than from others, so that they burdened nobody. In both points they thus furnished us with a noble example.'[1]

These British prelates, both those who had means to support themselves and the three who by their poverty prompted the admiration and praise of Sulpicius Severus,

[1] *Chronica*, ii. 41, Halm's ed. p. 94.

had come to Ariminum in the month of July, 359; they had come in obedience to Constantius, but they came instructed and forewarned by the enlightened teaching of Hilary. Except for this Epistle, some at least, if not many, might have been as ignorant of the Creed as Hilary himself was before 356. 'Though long ago regenerated (i. e. baptized),' he says, 'and for some time a bishop, I never heard of the Creed of Nicaea until I was going into exile.' Such would be the case with many of those whom the emperor's letter summoned to Ariminum with orders to discuss and decide respecting 'the faith and unity of the Church', and this in a controversy which, beyond anything experienced before, was a mass of subtleties. Certainly the *De Synodis* had provided them with timely help. Those who read it, however unexercised in the new subtle distinctions, yet, if only slightly conversant with the progress of thought in Christian doctrine, were prepared for Ursacius and Valens, the court bishops. These emissaries of the emperor, 'who had disturbed the whole Church by repeated changes of faith,' found neither smooth nor successful work at Ariminum.[1]

Probably the flow and ebb of controversy had not disturbed Britain, any more than Gaul, until the fifties of the fourth century; and there might be many Christians well instructed in the faith, knowing the Scriptures and the ancient Creed, who at that time, like Hilary himself a few years previously, had never seen the Creed of Nicaea, but 'found, as he also had found, in the Gospels and Epistles guidance for the understanding of *homousion* and *homoeusion*' (*sed mihi homousii et homoeusii intelligentiam Evangelia et Apostoli intimaverunt*, De Synod. 91). Thirty years had passed since the great Council sat at Nicaea, yet men holding the highest office in the Church—this bishop among the

[1] Fragmentum vii in Migne's *Hil.* ii. col. 695-99, gives some interesting notices of the Council. It was summoned by an *epistola* having a superscription that sounds strange to us—*Victor Constantius maximus triumphator semper Augustus episcopis*—wherein they were told to discuss *de fide et unitate*. Of Ursacius and Valens, Germinius and Gaius, it says, 'qui totiens mutando quod crediderant, omnes ecclesias turbaverunt, et nunc conantur haereticum animum suum inserere animis Christianis' (col. 697).

best—knew nothing of its Creed; and still less did they know of the later questions which had an important bearing on the final form taken by the Creed. Into this final form of Creed, popularly but inaccurately called 'Nicene', and sometimes 'Constantinopolitan', were inserted clauses of the real Nicene Creed; and this form slowly made its way into general acceptance in the West. Such was the slow evolution of what is called conciliar authority.

Bidding farewell to this (possibly numerous) contingent of British bishops at Ariminum, and the tyranny to which they were subjected, we learn but little of the Church in Britain until a new tide of religious sentiment had begun to make its way in the island. This was British Monachism, of which the earliest representatives known to us are Pelagius the so-called heresiarch, and St. Patrick the apostle of Ireland.

Still we cannot leave unnoticed certain other events, too rare indeed for our curious interest, which bring Britain into close relation with imperial and religious movements on the Continent.

Julian, at that time professedly a Christian, though in reality a heathen, had been Caesar of the West since November 6, 255, but had been too actively engaged against the German barbarians on the frontiers of Gaul to take any open part in the theological absolutism which was attempting to grind down the Churches of Italy, Gaul, and Britain. He had probably little, if any, sympathy with it. To Julian the filling of his granaries on the Rhine was the object of real importance; plentiful harvests in Britain and other supplies from there were of equal importance to secure. But the Roman troops serving against the barbarians on the Rhine frontier were threatened with scarcity by the devastation which in 360 spread from the north over the fields of civilized Britain. Four predatory incursions are mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus.[1] The first of

[1] *Ammiani Marcellini Rerum Gestarum Libri qui supersunt*, edited by Eysenhardt. Only the last eighteen books of this important work are extant. Marcellinus was himself an officer under Julian and an eye-

these was of so grave a character that the troops in Britain were unable to cope with the barbarian hosts, and special expeditions had to be fitted out by Julian for their suppression. In 360 'the Scots and Picts, fierce nations, broke the peace, and began to plunder the neighbouring districts, thus causing alarm to the provinces already wasted by a succession of disasters in the past. To put an end to this misery Lupicinus was sent over with two legions and a strong auxiliary force of the *Heruli* and *Batavi*' (Dio Cassian). There was a cohort—the First—of the Batavians stationed on the Wall of Hadrian at Procolitia (now Carrawburgh), as stated in the *Notitia Dignitatum*,[1] and as witnessed by inscriptions, but whether they belonged to the auxiliaries of Lupicinus or came over at another time cannot be known with any certainty.

In 364, under Valentinian, the predatory tribes were at work again. Now, however, they are joined by the Saxons and the Atacotti (*Picti Saxonesque et Scotti et Atacotti*). Ammianus seems to regard this furious rush only as part of a great deluge of barbarian invasion which then seemed about to flood the Western empire; 'the Alemanni laid waste Gaul and Rhaetia at the same time; the Sarmatians and the Quadi Pannonia; the Picts, Saxons, Scotti, and Atacotti harassed the Britons with continuous hardships';[2] Africa suffered from Moorish tribes, Thrace from the Goths. We have in this fact a reason why the Saxons are mentioned.

The years 367 and 368 brought a repetition of similar ravages carried on by the Picts (consisting of two tribes—Dicalydones and Verturiones), the Atacotti, and Scotti with disastrous results; Nectaridus, the count of the sea-coast, was killed, and Duke Fullofaudes was made prisoner. Then, after the unsuccessful trial of others, an energetic general was

witness of many events narrated in his History. The extant portions were written at Rome in 390. He was thus contemporary with the emperors who followed Julian down to Theodosius the Great, but the History does not extend later than 378, so that his valuable help is lacking for Gratian and Theodosius.

[1] See Böcking's edition of the *Notitia*, p. 114.

[2] Amm. Marcell. xxvi. 4. 5.

found to put an end to these miseries. This was Theodosius, a wealthy Spanish provincial and father of Theodosius the Great. Sailing from Boulogne with large fresh forces, Theodosius crossed to Richborough, and advanced to London (Lundinum), 'an ancient city which later times called Augusta,'[1] so far south had the barbarian hordes ventured; but they were successfully driven back by Count Theodosius, and Britain was once again restored to the empire. The piratical sallies of the Saxons also ceased for a time.

It is known that the general who succeeded in restoring rest and prosperity to the island was a Christian, though, as in the case of Constantine and others, his baptism did not take place until the last days of his life.[2] His son, the future emperor, is supposed to have shared the campaign with him, so that the man who afterwards gave to the Christian Church that position not only of alliance with the State, but of ascendancy over it which continued for over a thousand years, appears to meet us for the first time in Britain. This fact is, however, not very clearly made out.[3]

These people from the north of Britain and the Irish hordes from their own island were driven back (A. D. 360, 370), and the harassed province enjoyed a period of quiet of about thirteen years.

[1] Amm. Marcell. xxvii. 1. 1, 5.

[2] Orosius, vii. 23.

[3] The words of the panegyrist, who is regarded as supplying this information, are somewhat vague; Theodosius might be about twenty or twenty-one years of age in 367–8, and the rhetorician says: 'et prius quidem quam ad illa veniam quae aevi maturus egisti, summatim tuum illud attingam cum patre divino castrense collegium actas sub pellibus hiemes . . . gravissimas pugnas terra marique pugnatas.' It is a very natural inference that such expressions refer solely to the expedition against the Picts and Scots carried out by the father.

CHAPTER XI

NEW RELIGIOUS POLICY

Gratian began his reign when quite a child upon the death of his father Valentinian I, in 375, but at that time he was under the strong influence of St. Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, so that, when the fatal battle of Adrianople (Aug. 9, 378) left the eastern boundaries on the Danube to the mercy of the Goths, it is not improbable that his selection of Theodosius to be emperor of the East was due to the bishop's advice. The battle of Adrianople must be considered as a great landmark in the history of the Roman empire; not only were the Goths soon after it pacified, and many of them admitted to the highest offices in State and army, but in less than twenty years the Church had taken a new position of ascendancy that would be felt everywhere. We have seen her regarded as an enemy hostile to imperial interests, and in consequence subjected to persecution, in which Britain had its share. Under Constantine she enters into the enjoyment of freedom and of favour; but after Adrianople (378), chiefly through the instrumentality of the three men named, Christianity becomes the State religion of the empire. Ecclesiastical unity was attained, though by means that were unspiritual and despotic, and when secured, it had entailed a significant loss of power to the State. The sixteenth book of the *Codex Theodosianus*, that codification of Roman laws issued from 312 to 436, reads almost as a book of Canon Law or as a series of Acts of Uniformity. We find here the Edict issued on February 27, 380, declaring that all Christians are bound to follow the orthodox faith as held or declared by Damasus, Bishop of Rome, and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria. Then follow Edicts against heresies. But after the Council of Constantinople

another Edict on Catholic orthodoxy appears without the name of the Bishop of Rome as guarantor of the true faith, but with the names of Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople, Timotheus, Bishop of Alexandria, and others, bishops of Churches in Asia Minor. The Roman emperor's policy of absolutism, initiated by Diocletian and maintained under Constantine, becomes more evident under Gratian and Theodosius. This despotism showed itself in measures that cast aside the religious neutrality of Constantine and Valentinian, and particularly in the severities which the laws inflicted on heathens and dissidents from the accepted faith and order. We cannot regard Britain as free from the working of these harsh measures. It may, however, be said that they were not carried out except loosely, for many such stout heathens as Symmachus held office both at Rome and in the provinces during the whole life of Theodosius.

In 376 or in 382—the date is uncertain—Gratian refused the title of Pontifex Maximus.[1] This meant that heathenism as the official religion was put aside. Hitherto it had been identified with the numerous symbols and signs which notified the union between the State and religion, but now all privilege and formal ascendancy was ended. The moneys which had supported heathen feasts were henceforth to be divided between the public treasury and the office of the praetorian prefect; funds which had supported the vestals and priests were diverted to imperial purposes; the lands also that had belonged to temples and sacred *collegia* were to become the property of the public treasury.

These enactments would affect the temples referred to above as being built in Britain, and the secular priesthoods established there.

Falling heathenism provoked one great debate in which the champions on either side were Q. Aurelius Symmachus and Ambrose, Bishop of Milan. The debate was occasioned by an embassy from the heathen members of the Roman

[1] Seeck's *Chronica Symmachi*, p. liii. Godefredus, in his Commentary on *Codex Theodosianus*, ix. 35. 3, places these measures in 376; *Epp.* 17, 18 of Ambrose are supposed to favour 382. The confiscation of temple lands and revenues, no doubt, belongs to 382.

senate praying for the restoration of the altar and statue of Victory in the senate-house. Roman senators since the time of Augustus had been accustomed to take their oath at this heathen altar, but Gratian had removed it. Hence the embassy. Symmachus was regarded as the most accomplished orator among the senators. Ambrose was the astutest of bishops. Their speeches have been preserved. Symmachus, though come to plead for toleration, and professing to be without prejudices, takes his stand upon the ideas of a heathen State religion which must lead to compulsion. One sentence of his on religion and the deity has been often quoted: 'It is not by one way,' he remarks, 'that we can reach so great a mystery'—'uno itinere non potest perveniri ad tam grande secretum.'[1]

Ambrose on the other hand used no little raillery—all this trouble about seven vestals made poor, when the Christians have quite a nation of men and women who practise virginity, *videte plebem pudoris.* The heathen religion deprived of its emoluments is in the same position as the Christians; it desired to be a 'salaried religion'. He defends change, Boissier remarks, as the necessary condition of progress. Symmachus is a man of the past, Ambrose of the present and future; Symmachus holds that the gods of a city are inseparable from it, and that to them all citizens, as citizens, owe worship; Ambrose claims liberty of conscience in respect of a heathen altar placed in the senate-house, where so many Christians must go in their public capacity as senators, and asks whether 'even in a common assembly there shall be a common position'—'etiamne in communi consilio non erit communis conditio?'

The Empress Justina, widow of Valentinian I, showed strong Arian leanings after the murder of her son, Gratian. She and her other son, Valentinian II, came to Milan, in their flight before the growing power of the British usurper Maximus. Ambrose, by fearless, tactful strength, proved more than a match for her and for the despotic ways that had ruled in the imperial court since Diocletian. On two

[1] Seeck, *Relatio Symmachi*, pp. liv, 280.

occasions he stood for methods more Christian than a court that had grown out of purely pagan beginnings was inclined to take, and probably gained more than he was at the time conscious of in his direction of the policy of Gratian and Theodosius. 'When the State surrendered its neutrality,' Schiller remarks, 'it surrendered itself; this is the significance of the policy of Gratian and Theodosius, which gave to Catholic orthodoxy the place of a State Church.'[1] This great change meant that henceforth, in Ambrose's own words, 'imperator intra ecclesiam, non supra ecclesiam, est,'—'the emperor is within the Church, not above it.'

Our discussion thus far has had for its object to delineate the background that lies behind particular movements of individuals or Churches. The change would, ere long, become general and affect Britain, as it undoubtedly did in the person of Maximus (Maxen Wledic). Coming from our shores and marching through Gaul with his mind on Italy, he follows the same religious policy of suppression as Gratian and Theodosius. He, a British usurper, accepts the new position.

THE TWO TYRANNI

I

Maximus, A.D. 383–7

Britain sweeps Maximus into an empire of this changed character about A.D. 383, by a usurpation on his part for which others were almost equally responsible. As he comes within our view, he is a Christian, newly baptized and orthodox, one who, in pursuance of his final object—the conquest of Italy—carried on a correspondence with Siricius, the Bishop of Rome, on the subject of the orthodox faith, that is orthodox as opposed to Arian. Our own British writer's (Gildas's) information becomes fuller at this point, a fact which is the more noteworthy when we find him as a keen and true narrator of facts comparing well

[1] *Geschichte der röm. Kaiserzeit*, ii, p. 415; Duchesne, *Histoire ancienne de l'Église*, p. 655.

with Nennius and Geoffrey of Monmouth,[1] who are apt to fall into confusion.

'At length also, as thickets of tyrants were growing up and bursting forth soon into an immense forest, the island retained the Roman name, but not the morals and law; nay rather, casting forth a shoot of its own planting, it sends out Maximus to the two Gauls accompanied by an immense following, with an emperor's ensign in addition, which he never worthily bore nor legitimately, but as one elected after the manner of a tyrant and with the initiative of a turbulent soldiery.' These are the words written in Britain by Gildas.[2] The 'thicket of tyrants' probably means all those in this island, from Albinus to Allectus, followed later by Maximus and Constantinus, who aimed at the imperial power in an irregular way. Some had succeeded, many had failed; but the partial success and final ruin of two, both of whom were proclaimed in Britain by the Roman soldiery, reveal to us some glimpses of the religious life in Britain at the end of the fourth century and the beginning of the fifth. These two are Magnus Clemens Maximus, and Constantinus, called Constantine the Tyrant, to distinguish him from Constantine the Great: the former was proclaimed in 383, the latter in 407.

Information about Maximus is drawn from the following writings:—

Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, iv. 35; Paulus Orosius, *Historiae*, vii. 34, 35; Sulpicius Severus, *Vita Martini*, 23; Ambrose, *Epp.* xxiv, xxvi; Socrates, *Hist. Ecclesiastica*, v. 11, 12, 14; Sozomen, *Hist. Eccles.* vii. 13; Panegyric of Pacatus Drepanus, 23, 28, 31–6; Marcellinus, *Chronicle*; *Historia Miscella*, 23, 28, 31; Prosper Tiro of Aquitaine, *Chronicle* (Mommsen's edition, *Chronica Minora*, i, pp. 343 ff.); Aurelius Victor, *Epitome*, 47, 48.

Of modern works the best are Gibbon, chapter xxvii; Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. i, part ii; Schiller, *Geschichte der Kaiserzeit*, pp. 405 ff., 421 ff.; Güldenpenning und Ifland, *Der Kaiser Theodosius der Grosse*, pp. 122 ff., 149 ff.

The writers named above deal with the whole of the

[1] By Nennius (c. 27) Maximus is called Maximianus, and Geoffrey follows him (v. 12): the Welsh translator gives him the name Maxen, pp. 115–20. In *Indexes to Old Welsh Genealogies*, published by Mr. Anscombe, the name is Maxim Guletic: *Archiv für Celt. Lexicographie*, i. 206.

[2] Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, c. 13.

insurrectionary movement of which Maximus had been proclaimed the head by the Roman troops serving in Britain;[1] but in these pages the briefest outline is all that need be given. Gratian, who, with his infant brother Valentinian II, had become emperor of the West in 375, after the appointment of Theodosius the Great as emperor of the East (January 10, 379), was suspected of favouring the barbarians. These Franks and Goths, the former still heathen, the latter, though Christians, Arians, were being advanced to high posts in the army and the State. Barbarian troops also were taking the place of the Roman legionaries. Such measures were no doubt politic, if not necessary, and were afterwards adopted on a large scale by Theodosius. Yet they caused extreme irritation among provincial troops, to whom rumours had also come that Gratian, so far from showing due energy in public affairs, was absorbed in the pastime of the chase and similar pleasures. Zosimus dwells on the unpopularity of Gratian among the soldiery because of the favours shown by him to the Alani. Orosius describes Maximus somewhat favourably as a man of strong character and probity, worthy to be Augustus, but drawn almost reluctantly and against his will to the perilous office.[2] *In Britannia per seditionem militum Maximus imperator est creatus*, is the short mention of him in the Chronicle of Prosper Tiro.[3]

Dr. Hodgkin, after a survey of all the available evidence, concludes as follows: 'It is possible that he (Maximus) was rather the instrument than the author of the mutiny,[4] and this is exactly the implication conveyed by the British writer Gildas, who charges Britain herself with the guilt and evil consequences of the unhappy step.' It was, however, *Roman* Britain that planned and executed the insur-

[1] *Historia Nova*, iv. 35 τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις κατὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἔτεκε μῖσος.

[2] *Historiae*, vii. 34 'in Britannia invitus propemodum ab exercitu imperator creatus.'

[3] Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, i, p. 461.

[4] *Italy and her Invaders*, i. 402.

rection. 'Not legitimately,' Gildas says, 'but after the manner of a usurper, and with the initiative of a turbulent soldiery, did Britain send out Maximus to the two Gauls.'[1] Here we find a capable man drawn into the vortex of an insurrectionary movement against a young emperor who had, more than any before him, stood as the bold originator of a new policy more than favourable to the orthodox or Catholic Church.

When Maximus was proclaimed emperor in Britain, the Church attitude in the island, of a similar character to the attitude adopted towards his later progress through Gaul, made it prudent for him to be baptized as one of the orthodox faithful. Delay of baptism, we know, was common in that age, as is seen in the Lives of Constantine, Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nazienz, of Nectarius, the Bishop of Constantinople, and Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, the last two of whom had been elected bishops before their baptism. Generally the holy rite was submitted to at some crisis in the lives of men, when they felt they were about to die, or at the time of their 'conversion' as they purposed abandoning the world to become monks, or immediately before consecration to ecclesiastical office. So Maximus, while making his preparations in Britain, thought it fit that he should be baptized, and by this submission gives indirect evidence that Church life was strong in Britain at the time. He started for the Continent not only as the restorer of Roman conservatism, but also as the champion of the orthodoxy he had learnt and professed in this island. Gildas, in the two chapters devoted to Maximus (cc. 13, 14), evidently writes as one having a firm and clear grasp of the real trend of events at the time, and of the character of the tyrant. Prominence is given to his cunning artfulness (*callida ars*), and to the perjury and falsehood of which he was guilty. These features are also amply attested by other writers of the fourth and fifth centuries. It was by craft he brought about the murder of Gratian in 383, and later endeavoured to hide this foul act under a cloak of

[1] *De Excidio Brit.* c. 13.

decency.[1] Nevertheless his zeal for orthodoxy, as against the partial Arianism of Valentinian II and his mother Justina, did not deceive either St. Martin of Tours or the statesman-bishop of Milan. But it certainly impressed quite a number of bishops in Gaul, by whom he was led to an act which has ever blackened his and their memory, as being the first to cause blood to be shed for heresy. The same assumption of eagerness to protect the orthodox faith seems also to have made a somewhat favourable impression on the mind of Siricius, the Bishop of Rome, with whom he corresponded in 386.

His baptism in Britain at the outset, his active promotion of the Nicene faith and the clumsy repression of heresy which he attempted, may have been due to a desire to imitate Theodosius. This short career, begun in Britain, in which Maximus managed to get himself recognized as a third emperor, was brought to an end by Theodosius, after his two successful battles of Siscia and Haemona, when Maximus was put to death 'at the third milestone from Aquileia'. The victory over the British usurper had the significant effect of making Theodosius sole ruler in the empire.

By the withdrawal of the forces needed for the defence of Britain, Maximus had exposed the parts south of the Wall of Hadrian to the old incursions of the northern barbarians. They came to rob and murder, the Scots (Irish) coming from the north-west, the Picts from the north as Gildas narrates.

Theodosius remained in the West, after his victory over Maximus, from August, 388, to the summer of 391, during which time the ruin and havoc caused in our island by the incursions of the barbarians were probably energetically repaired by him. We have, it is true, no definite evidence of such reparation except what is read in Gildas's *De Excidio*; but, as has been previously mentioned, he seems to have reliable information for this

[1] Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Franc.* i. 38 'In urbe Treverica sedem instituens Gratianum imperatorem circumventum dolis interfecit.'

period. Two expeditions, he tells us, were sent for this object. They might have arrived between 388–9 and 406. In the Poems of Claudian, written before 404, one of the expeditions is connected with the name of Stilicho, the famous general whom Theodosius, at his death in 395, made guardian of his son, the young Emperor Honorius. Speed, in his work entitled *Great Britaine*, gives the following quaint version of lines in Claudian's poem on 'The First Consulship of Stilicho' (A.D. 400). Britain is made to say of him :—

> When Seas did foame with strokes of Oares,
> That beat the billowes backe,
> His force effecting with his cares,
> Prevented still my wracke:
> He bade me fear no forraine powers,
> That Picts or Scots could make,
> Nor of the Saxons that on Seas,
> Uncertaine courses take.[1]

Socrates, in his *History*, makes mention of a certain Novatian at Constantinople named Chrysanthus, who, after the death of Sisinnius, at an advanced age, and against his will, was made bishop (*προβὰς δὲ τῇ ἡλικίᾳ . . . εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἄκων εἱλκύσθη*).[2] This man, the son of a Novatian bishop and well known among the Novatians, had been Governor, or, as the term went, Vicar, of Britain under Theodosius the Great, and so before 395. We can well infer that, since the chief representative of the empire in Britain was a trusted member of the Novatian Church, there must have prevailed there the same freedom as was found then and afterwards at Constantinople itself. The

[1] Claudian's poems, so far as they relate to Britain, may be read in the *Monumenta Hist. Brit.* xcvii, xcviii. The following three verses seem to confirm Gildas; they refer to A.D. 400:—

> 'Venit et extremis legio praetenta Britannis,
> Quae Scoto dat frena truci, ferroque notatas
> Perlegit exsangues Picto moriente figuras.'

'The Second Consulship of Stilicho,' ibid., p. xcviii, 2nd col. But see also Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, iii, p. 525, and Bury's *Life of St. Patrick*, pp. 325–31.

[2] Socrates, *H. E.* vii. 12.

orthodox Catholic and the Novatian lived in Britain together in concord.[1]

II

Constantine, A.D. 407–11.

On account of the general similarity of the relations of the 'tyrants' both to the Church and to the empire, it is desirable to consider them consecutively, although the second of them takes us into the first years of the fifth century. Our information is obtained from:

Orosius, *Historiae*, vii.

Sozomen, *Historia Eccles.* ix.

Zosimus, *Historia Nova*, v; from him also we derive our knowledge of the abandonment of Britain by the empire.

Dr. Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*; Gibbon, ch. xxx, and the Appendix to vol. iii of Gibbon's work in Prof. Bury's edition, and pp. 329–31 in *Life of St. Patrick*; Duchesne, *Fastes Épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, i, p. 94; and above all Freeman's article in the *English Historical Review*, 1886, entitled *Tyrants of Britain, Gaul, and Spain.*

The presumably happy days which the intervention of Theodosius and his general Stilicho brought to Britain did not continue long. In the last days of December, 406, the barbarian hosts of Vandals and Alani crossed the Rhine to attack the rich provinces of Gaul.[2] The news of their incursion caused great uneasiness in Britain, where many Gallic troops were then serving; fearing a general

[1] Socrates speaks highly of this quondam Vicar of the Province of Britain: 'He was a man of extraordinary wisdom and prudence; the churches of the Novatians at Constantinople were preserved and increased through him. He was also the first to distribute gold to the poor out of his own means; from the churches he received nothing except two loaves of the blessed bread every Sunday. So careful was he of his own church that he took Ablabius, the eloquent orator from the school of Troilus the Sophist, and advanced him to the post of presbyter.' The sermons of Ablabius, Socrates adds, were well known in the churches.

[2] 'Wandali et Halani Gallias traiecto Rheno ingressi ii. K. Ian. Prosper Tiro,' *Mon. Germ. Hist., Chron.* ix, pp. 465, 466.

collapse of the Western Empire, they set about electing an emperor of their own. After making trial of two others, Marcus and Gratian, they fixed finally upon one bearing the honoured name of Constantine, anticipating from this fact a strong and effective rule.[1]

The Goths were ravaging Italy, compelling the Emperor Honorius to retreat from Milan to Ravenna: the barbarians of Germany had at the same time crossed the Rhine, and were threatening North Gaul and Trier. When Constantine in 407 crossed over from Britain, he seems to have come to some understanding with the barbarians, as he is known to have occupied Trier, and then to have turned his steps south. A good part of Gaul, in which he made Arles his capital, submitted to him; then he occupied Spain, and Honorius was compelled to recognize him as Augustus. About this time, while the barbarians also were pushing their way into Spain, his son Constans, a monk, was made Caesar.[2] His fall, however, was not long delayed; after a prolonged siege Arles was taken in 411, by the *patricius* Constantius, Honorius's favourite, and Constantine was killed, and his head sent to Ravenna.

The chief point of interest is the isolation of Britain during these years (407–11).

Constantine was a British Christian, but he gained the goodwill of several Gallic bishops. One of these was Heros, Bishop of Arles, the capital, whom Prosper styles *vir sanctus et beati Martini discipulus,* who also made earnest stipulations respecting the usurper's safety with the victorious general Constantius, granting him as well the right of asylum in his church. Other bishops, who were also disciples of St. Martin, were favourable to Constantine.[3] Had Constans, the son of Constantine, become a monk in

[1] Sozomen, *H. E.* ix. 11 *οἰηθέντες καθότι ταύτην εἶχε προσηγορίαν καὶ βεβαίως αὐτὸν κρατήσειν τῆς βασιλείας.* Also Orosius, *Historiae,* vii. 40, may be compared, and particularly Zosimus, *Historia Nova,* vi. 3. 1.

[2] Orosius, vii. 40. 7 'Adversus nos Constantinus Constantem filium, pro dolor! ex monacho Caesarem factum . . . in Hispaniam misit.'

[3] Prosper, *M. G. H. Chron.* ix, ad ann. 412. Ibid., *Chronica Gallica,* pp. 466, 654.

Britain before A.D. 407? If such a fact could be established it would be of some weight in deciding the time of the introduction of Monachism to this island. It is certainly more probable, from the favour shown to the father by disciples of St. Martin, that the son was one of them and had been drawn to join the eager crowds of Gallic men who before the saint's death (which took place in 397), and later, adopted as his disciples the ascetic life.[1] Constans can scarcely have become a monk in Britain.

[1] *Vide* Sulpicius Severus, *Life of St. Martin*, 7; *Ep.* iii, *ad Bassulam*; and Duchesne, *Fastes Épiscopaux*, vol. ii, p. 299. A date three years later is also given, viz. 400.

CHAPTER XII

THE CHURCH IN BRITAIN AS PART OF WESTERN CHRISTENDOM

Fifth Century

About A.D. 400, we find that there was, in all Christian lands, the idea of one Church called the Catholic Church. Membership of this Church, whether for individuals or communities, was dependent upon the acceptance of the faith, and upon general conformity with the existing ecclesiastical order. Dissidents from the teaching of the Church were heretics, while those who held the common faith, but refused to conform to her discipline, ordinances, or government, were termed schismatics. Although there was no recognized central authority, the Church throughout the entire Roman empire had arrived at an essential uniformity. There is no call here to discuss the cause or causes that produced this striking fact. But some time before 400 there had been a strong tendency towards an intensifying grouping of another kind with great results. The Eastern section spoke of *οἱ δυτικοί* or the *Westerns—Occidentales* or *ecclesia Occidentalis*, and to the life and thought of this Western Church Britain belonged. The one Roman empire was further beginning to break up into separate parts. The nations of modern times were beginning to be formed. Before the century was far advanced many countries had been lost to the empire; but the Church promoted intercourse between countries far removed from one another. The teaching of Augustine also tended to differentiate West from East; Greek Christian literature was being put into Latin by such men as Ambrose, Jerome, and Rufinus; but this influence was not fresh, and Churches using the Latin tongue began, in the fifth century, to form

a distinct group. Even the great Oecumenical or General Councils of 431 and 451 saw but few representatives of the West; the Constantinopolitan Council of 381 was purely Eastern. Still there was no separation, and in the doctrinal result of the Council of Chalcedon, 451 (the greatest Council after Nicaea), there was given, through Leo the Great's *Epistola Dogmatica*, a particular Western colouring to a formula which the Church[1] of the East possesses in common with that of the West.

The Western Churches, though comprising peoples of different languages, employed no language but Latin for worship and for religious literature generally. In Britain and Ireland, as in Gaul and Germany, the Church language with these materials for thought was Latin, though the native languages still continued in use side by side with it. Those parts of Britain that were most Romanized must have had a large non-Roman population speaking another tongue. It remained so in Gaul for a long time. In the *Dialogues* of Sulpicius Severus of Aquitaine, a *Gallus* is invited to speak of St. Martin, but as he hesitates on account of his bad Latin, Postumianus urges him to speak *vel Celtice aut si mavis Gallice*,[2] just as if it were said to one of my own countrymen, 'Speak in the British tongue, or if you prefer to call it so, in Welsh.' This implies that the Aquitanian himself knew the Celtic language of Gaul. Gregory of Tours in the sixth century understood it, and one may infer from his words that Celtic speech was common in such cities as Clermont and Autun. The editor of M. Fustel de Coulanges' *La Gaule romaine* says, that he does not share that learned historian's views regarding the early disappearance of the Celtic language.[3] 'Latin did not

[1] In the Formula of Chalcedon there are reproduced almost verbally words of the Symbol of Union, 433, phrases from Cyril of Alexandria, phrases from Leo's *Epistola Dogmatica*. Almost the only *new* part is the collocation of the celebrated four terms—without confusion, without change, without dissolution, without separation.

[2] *Dial.* i.

[3] 'C'est un devoir pour moi d'ajouter franchement que, sur plus d'un point, je ne puis partager l'opinion de l'auteur, par exemple sur la question des colonies, *de la disparition de la langue celtique*, de l'organi-

achieve its conquest very quickly, and it did not gain supremacy while Gaul was Roman' (Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*). If such was the case in Gaul, much more should we expect that the masses of the people in Britain spoke the Celtic tongue or tongues. Yet it was not unlikely that through the Church, more even than through the courts, trade, or schools, many would become acquainted with Latin, especially ecclesiastical Latin. The language and style of Pelagius and Fastidius lead us to infer that the schools of the empire, provided by municipal bodies, did their work well in Britain. The grammar schools, for children from seven to fourteen, were found everywhere, and grammar meant an extensive training in literature, so that the schools were powerful agents in the diffusion of Latin culture. Above the grammar school was the school of rhetoric, which, in the fourth and fifth centuries, began to tell upon the Church in its liturgies for the becoming worship of God, in its controversial literature, in its sermons, and the regular conduct of Church life by those to whose charge the communities were entrusted.[1] Here came into play the enormous influence of Augustine, in language no less than in thought.

Britain was not so thoroughly Romanized as Gaul. At York, London, Gloucester, Lincoln, Verulam, Viroconium, Segontium, Caerlleon, and other places, there might have been many Britons who, benefiting by the social and official surroundings of such centres, with their schools and trade, had become well Romanized. Welshmen use every day a large number of words relative to architecture, agriculture, handicrafts, and, not least, to religion, which were undoubtedly borrowed from the Romans ; still, the language they speak is in its entire structure Celtic. These are loan-

sation municipale, *de la fusion des races*, des jurisdictions provinciales,' Pref. ix.

[1] The subject of education under the empire is treated with great ability and thoroughness by Boissier, *Fin du Paganisme*, vol. i, pp. 171–355 ; Roger, M., *L'enseignement des Lettres Classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin* (1905), especially pp. 207 ff. ; Dill, *Roman Society in the Last Century of the Roman Empire*. Of equal and, in some ways, of greater profit is Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*, Lecture i.

words.[1] Latin may have been used in other places, wherever, indeed, Romans or Gallo-Romans dwelt, as on the south-east and south coast of the island. If all the British, or the majority of them, had taken to speaking the corrupt Latin which we find in the inscriptions of the third and fourth centuries, they would, after the departure of the Roman legions, have developed a kind of Romance language, such as is found in the *lingua rustica* that has become French. The theory of the rebirth of the British tongue, advanced by some writers, seems very improbable. British, or as we now say, Welsh, was in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries spoken where the Roman town of Viroconium stood. Venta Silurum, it is now known, was a Roman country town, yet in the whole of that district the language remained British, as it did in more remotely east parts. Just as there were Gallo-Romans on the other side of the Channel, so there were Britanno-Romans in this island, with a varying but larger following of Celtic-speaking Britons. And of the former Gildas speaks words that carry in them a significance beyond what is at first apparent, when he says that the victor over the Saxons—Ambrosius Aurelius—was *solus forte Romanae gentis.* Almost the sole representative of that class of provincials, Roman in origin, in culture, and habits, he gave the British, some time before 500, the leadership they required.[2]

All the writings of the period, whether by Britons or Irishmen or Gauls or Spaniards, are in Latin. The Bible was in Latin, in which language also the Church carried on its worship. We have evidence, of British origin, that preaching, where needed, was carried on in the vernacular. Catechizing might have been carried on in the vernacular also. The Scriptures were read in Latin, but not in Jerome's version, and the phrases and passages that would have been

[1] See Loth, *Les Mots Latins dans les Langues Britanniques.* Altogether, belonging of course to different periods, there are collected here over 950 Latin loan-words used in Welsh; it is easy to add many to their number.

[2] Gildas, *De Exc. Br.* c. 25. In later legend this last of the Romans appears as Emrys Wledic.

precious to the soul of an intelligent Christian in Britain about 350 or even about 450 were, in a large number of instances, quite different in form from those known in other Christian countries or in Britain itself at a later period. Their Bible was an old Bible, older than Jerome's version, and their canon, it should be noted, was unlike that of any Church of to-day.

No words, for instance, could be better known or more frequently quoted than those addressed by Christ to Martha: 'But one thing is needful.' Yet if we look into the Life of Paul of Leon (*Vita Pauli Leonensis*)—a fellow disciple of St. David, Gildas and Samson under Illtud (*Ildutus*)—we find a very different reading, which proves to what an extent old texts had been preserved in Britain. One of the most competent of writers on Latin versions of Scripture and the codices which contain them, the late M. Samuel Berger, says that this form of words *paucis vero opus est, aut etiam uno*,[1] although well known in Greek, is *quite unknown in Latin*, except in the one Irish MS. of the Gospels called *The Book of Mulling*. But it is the reading adopted in the Greek Testaments of Westcott and Hort, and Nestle; it is given also in the margin of the English revised version.

The *De Excidio* of Gildas also proves that the writer possessed and used codices of the old Latin Bible for most, if not all the books of Scripture, but this is a subject to which we shall refer again in Chapter XXII.

But here we are met with a singular fact which throws light on an earlier time. Gildas was probably born before A.D. 500; during his youth and afterwards, in accordance with a custom of the monastery, which had been borrowed from the Tabenessiot monks of Egypt,[2] he committed much of the Bible to memory. Oftentimes he quotes many scrip-

[1] 'But it is few things that are needful, or even one.' Luke x. 42 (*V. Pauli*, c. 17).

[2] See *Historia Lausiaca*, part ii, edited by Butler, p. 96 (see also note, p. 211), ἀποστηθίζουσι δὲ πάσας τὰς γραφάς 'they learn by heart all the Scriptures'. The Latin *Regula* (Holsten, 139, 140) says that no one was allowed to stay in the monastery who did not learn by heart at least the Psalter and the New Testament.

tural passages from memory, and the passages so quoted differ from the same when copied from a codex of the Vulgate. They are of the older version. A few instances will illustrate this peculiarity. In a long citation from Isaiah he certainly had a codex of the Vulgate before him, but such well-known words as those of Isa. xlviii. 22, standing alone, he quoted from memory. Our version is: *There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked*; Vulg. *Non est pax impiis dicit Dominus Deus*; but Gildas wrote the words as follows: *Non est gaudere impiis, dicit Dominus*, i.e. *There is no being joyful for the wicked*, a rude literal rendering of *οὐκ ἔστιν χαίρειν λέγει Κύριος τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν* of the Septuagint version. So again, 2 Chron. xix. 2 in the Vulgate reads: *Impio praebes auxilium et his qui oderunt Dominum amicitia iungeris, et idcirco iram quidem Domini merebaris*; but in Gildas: *Si peccatorem tu adiuvas aut quem Dominus odit tu diligis, propterea ira Dei est super te.* The Vulgate has in Jer. vi. 14: *Dicentes: pax pax, et non erat pax.* But Gildas had learnt to say: *Qui dicunt pax pax, et non erit pax*—'Who say, Peace, peace, and there shall not be peace.' His Bible, the Bible of his youth, had such rude Latin as *filii sine lege* for *ἄνομοι, lignum sine sanitate* for *ξύλον ἀνίατον*, and *salutare declarationis vestrae non accipiam*, corresponding to the Greek of Codex A, *σωτηρίου ἐπιφανείας ὑμῶν οὐκ ἐπιβλέψομαι* (cc. 59, 85). Many other instances might be adduced.

We thus see that a writer who had just completed his forty-third year about A.D. 540 had learned Scripture at a time when the version of Jerome was little, if at all, used in Britain. In A.D. 380–400 there could have been no other than the ancient Latin version.

Another curious fact that is worth mentioning, respecting the Bible used in Britain during the fifth century, is the following:—In the *Praefatio in Librum Job* Jerome states that previous to their insertion by him in a former version, viz. that *with asterisks*, from seven to eight hundred lines were wanting to the Book of Job. That version was a revision of the Old Latin translation, which had been in existence from a date earlier than the writings of Tertullian, and was based upon the text of the Septuagint *as it existed*

before Origen. Origen states that there were 'frequently three or four, sometimes fourteen or nineteen lines omitted' in the Septuagint text, and the asterisks which he affixed to the lines or verses added by him from Theodotion's version have been preserved in some Greek, Latin, and Syriac MSS.[1] Jerome calls the old version a truncated book,[2] yet it was this which was read in Britain. Gildas quotes passages which consist of forty verses in the Vulgate, but seventeen of these are missing in his continuous citation. Fastidius, in his *De Vita Christiana*, always quotes the Old Testament from the older version, and Dr. White's cautious remarks in the *Biblical Text used by St. Patrick* (pp. 230–3) show that most of the passages of Scripture found in the Confession and Epistle are in Old Latin, full allowance being made for possible Vulgate citations. Yet Patrick had spent long years in Gaul. Pelagius also made protracted wanderings from his native Britain; but in the *Epistle to Demetrias* he makes numerous scriptural quotations, some long, some short, all of which show that his mind had been moulded by the Bible. He shows the same familiarity with Scripture as reappears a century or more later, in the extracts of Gildas. In this respect he was still a Briton when his hair was grey.

I have spoken of codices, but it would be well to observe also that complete copies of the Bible were exceedingly rare, even in the churches. We find, for instance, in the century following that Gregory of Tours speaks of '*three* volumes having been placed on the altar, *id est prophetiae* (the sixteen Prophetic books), *apostoli* (the Epistles), *atque euangeliorum* (the four Gospels)', *Hist. Fr.* iv. 16; in another place he speaks similarly of 'three books . . . that is the Psalms, the Histories (1, 2 Samuel; 1, 2 Kings), the (four) Gospels', ibid. v. 14. The whole collection, the *Bibliotheca*—the term used for a complete Bible—

[1] Cf. Caspari, *Das Buch Hiob in Hier.'s Übersetzung aus der Alex. Version nach einer Gallener Handschrift*, saec. viii. Christiania, 1893.

[2] 'Ante eam translationem quam sub asteriscis et obelis nuper edidimus, septingenti ferme aut octingenti versus desunt; ut decurtatus et laceratus corrosusque liber foeditatem sui publice legentibus praebeat.'

belonged to every Church and to many individuals; but, as we have seen, generally in three parts. In a volume of the Prophets the twelve Minor Prophets preceded the Books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and were regarded as one book. The Vulgate contained the books in their present order.

In Britain we find that *five books* are assigned to Solomon, though Jerome, Rufinus, and the Decretum Gelasii speak only of three (*Salomonis libri III*). The Book of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus appeared in the British canon of Scripture under the name of Solomon, as well as Proverbs, Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes. There was also included in it 3 Esdras (or 1 Esdras of the English and Welsh Apocrypha), and 4 Esdras (or 2 Esdras of the same Apocrypha).

It is evident from the citations in St. Patrick's writings and in Pelagius's *Epistle to Demetrias*, coupled with those in Gildas's *De Excidio*, that the British idea as to the number and authorship of Scriptural books did not quite agree with the view held by any Church of to-day.

Britain probably received its earliest copies of the Scriptures from Gaul,[1] and the resemblance between quotations in British writers and the readings of some well-known Gallic Old Latin MSS. seems to prove that it continued to receive them from Gaul for some time. The very rudeness of the Latin in some, reproduces peculiarities of speech that were perpetuated both in French and in the language of Britain. Instances of these from the Old Latin codex ff are *iscindamus* (Isa. xix. 24), *iscribis* (Capitula of Mark), *iscipiens* (Mark vi. 41), *ispumans* (Mark ix. 19); *iscribo*, *iscimus*, *esecuti*, *eseducere*, *istare*, *ispinans* and *iscientia* from the Fleury Palimpsest. In French and Welsh we find some of this rude Latin perpetuated. Old French has preserved it in forms like *escrire* = *écrire*, which has a similarity with the Welsh *ysgafn o yd* (*scamnum*), *ysgrif* (*scrib-o*), *escyn* (*scand-o*), &c. MSS. would, doubtless, be multiplied in Britain itself, but whether readings of this class, imported from Gaul

[1] It is held that the Irish text of the Vulgate Gospels came from Lerins before 432 (Dom Chapman, *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*). If so, copies containing it must have come through Britain. St. Patrick did not bring any such over, as he never uses that text.

directly, caused the insertion of the initial *y* (not seldom *e* or *i* in Old and Modern Welsh) in such words, I am unable to tell.

There are other indications of a wider significance which testify to a close communion between Britain and Gaul. Niceta was an active missionary bishop who, it is known, paid two visits to Paulinus of Nola, in 398 and 402; his name is also mentioned in letters of Pope Innocent of the years 409 and 414 (Burn, p. xxxv). Some remarkable inquiries have lately led to the conclusion that Niceta is the author of the *Te Deum*.

He wrote a sermon (*De Symbolo*) on the so-called Apostles' or Roman Creed. The Creed he comments upon was that held by the Danubian provinces, Pannonia and Dacia, from the middle of the fourth century. Now this and Gallican forms of the Creed are the first to include the clause 'communion of saints' (*sanctorum communio*), but it had not the words 'descended into hell' (*descendit ad inferna*). Further, Niceta's Creed agrees with the form found in the Bangor (Ulster) Antiphonary: 'I believe that there is a holy Catholic Church' (*sanctam esse ecclesiam catholicam*).[1] There is thus a coincidence in several clauses between Dacia, Gaul, Ireland, and (one must say) Britain. M. Duchesne had hinted at a probable cause of this fact. Certain liturgic and disciplinary usages were prevalent at Milan during the period of which we are writing. 'And this use,' Duchesne says, 'as can be proved from numerous documents, was followed in the Churches of northern Italy (the metropolitan diocese of Milan), of Gaul, of Spain, of Britain, and of Ireland.'[2] It was from Milan as a centre that these spread to the countries named. More specifically 'there was a strong set of the current of influence behind the Balkans through Aquileia to Milan, and so to Gaul'.[3] More may be said. Remesiana lay on the great military highway from Constantinople to Western Europe, through Sirmium and Pettau. From Pettau one road led to

[1] Dr. A. E. Burn, *Niceta of Remesiana, his Life and Works*. After the lapse of 1,500 years, he appears in these pages.

[2] *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, p. 83.

[3] Burn, p. lxxviii.

Aquileia, another to the Lake of Constance, and so entered Gaul by way of Basel. Along either of these roads Creeds and formularies developed under Greek influence might have reached Gaul without touching Rome. The similarity of the Creed of Niceta to the Gallican Creed of Faustus, Bishop of Riez, and the Irish Bangor Creed[1] shows that this is more than a bare possibility. There was thus an element of truth in the old contention, so far as based on the existence of Eastern peculiarities in British Christianity, that it came to these islands from Asia Minor, and by the same movement that brought it originally to Lugdunum (Lyon) in Gaul. The Eastern peculiarities which found acceptance in Gaul came also by the other route, and at a later time.

The Old Latin Bible, additions to Creed, formularies, perhaps also certain features of doctrine, seem to have come to Britain and Ireland from Gaul, some bearing a stamp that was Eastern in character having come from Constantinople. But in the early fifth century Britain began to borrow more directly from the monasteries of Marseilles and Lerins, or from men and institutions in sympathy with them. What was borrowed from these could not fail to show similar indications of an origin in Eastern Christianity. The older view has thus a basis of historical truth, in so far as it relates to the presence of Eastern characteristics in British Christianity, but not as indicating the path along which the Christian religion travelled hither at its first coming. The Eastern features came, presumably, together with certain liturgies and rites, from a region having its centre at the imperial city of Milan, and chiefly along the northern route indicated. But British Christianity was also affected by movements which originated in Southern Gaul, coming to this country in the train, it should not be forgotten, of Monachism.

[1] *Some Creed Problems*, by Rev. Thomas Barns, in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, July, 1906.

Britain and Later Conceptions

Within as short compass as possible the attempt will be made to describe the most marked features of very early mediaeval Christianity during this century in Britain.

The later course of religion, in a quiet country, is an index of the earlier. The bishop and the presbyter are universally regarded as priests, though the limits of their separate functions were not everywhere defined in the same way. In some parts, for instance, the presbyter, as well as the bishop, was accustomed, after the Oriental custom, to perform the rite of *confirmation* or *chrism*.[1] In the Roman Church it was not so; 'chrism on the forehead' was reserved in that Church for the bishop alone.[2] But the other mode, a survival of older usage, prevailed in Spain and in Sardinia. Gregory the Great, in 593, gave order that only bishops should 'anoint on the forehead' (*presbiteri baptizandos tangant in pectore, ut episcopi postmodum tangere debeant in fronte*), but because of the popular opposition aroused in these places yielded to them in 594, and allowed the more ancient custom to continue, though still limiting it to places where there were no bishops.[3] Britain and Ireland, owing to that separation from Roman influence which followed the coming of the barbarians, would be as likely as Spain, or other distant parts, to continue the older custom. That they did so, we have a clear indication in the fact that the second of the three demands made of the Britons by St. Augustine of Canterbury was as follows: 'That you *complete* the ministry of baptism by which we are

[1] See *Liber Ordinum*, Dom Marius Férotin, Benedictin de Farnborough, vol. v, p. 34 (1904), in *Mon. Eccl. Liturgica*.

[2] 'Presbyteris cum baptizant chrismate baptizatos ungere licet, non tamen frontem eodem oleo signare quod solis debetur episcopis cum tradunt spiritum paracletum,' Innoc. I (died 410).

Imposition of hands is in the West, not in the East, joined to this chrism.

[3] *M. G. H.* Ep. iv. 9 'Ianuario episcopo caralitano,' p. 242; and Ep. iv. 26, May, 594.

born again to God, according to the usage of the Holy Roman and Apostolic Church.'[1]

Warren's *Celtic Liturgies*, p. 216, and an article in the *Archaeologia Cambrensis* of January, 1871, quote a passage from a Life of St. Brigid, where two priests are described as anointing a girl, 'completing the order of Baptism according to custom,' *ordinem baptismi complentes consueto more*. Here *complere* means Confirmation.

The Stowe Missal contains special directions as to how a *presbyter* is to perform this rite. St. Bernard says that the rite of Confirmation was not performed in Ireland until it was *restored* by St. Malachi.[2] The implication must be that, because it was performed by a presbyter, it was, in his view, no Confirmation. That would be the view of a Roman ecclesiastic of this time, and even in an earlier time. In Britain and Ireland, during the fifth century, an old order existed, but in time changed, giving place to new.

In the same manner the reverence paid to martyrs and their tombs or relics was due to Rome, as well as the similar adoration of those eminent in ascetic rigour and superior holiness of life, together with the saints of Scripture. These practices did not come into vogue without opposition, yet they soon became popular, and spread everywhere. Even before the fifth century the works, not only of Jerome, but of the judicious Ambrose, in obedience to the popular demand, contain tales of wonderful miracles witnessed at the graves or through the virtue of the relics of saints and martyrs.

Perhaps, in taking this form, religious devotion assimilated something of heathen notions and usages, though giving them a Christian meaning. There was a lowering of Christian temper visible in the crude and material notions that possessed the souls of men at this period of the life of the Church. Leading as they did to extravagant legend and imposture, these superstitions *arrested* the improvement of the Church which the living treasures of

[1] Beda, *H. E.* ii. 2 'Ut ministerium baptizandi quo Deo renascimur, iuxta morem sanctae Romanae et apostolicae ecclesiae compleatis.'

[2] *Vita Malachi*, c. iii; Bern. *Opera*, i. 1473.

thought brought from the East made possible, and the thoughts of the Latin writers, the 'thoughts greater than their thought' which came from Ambrose, Jerome, and, above all, the gifted Augustine. These tendencies towards a lowering of conceptions surged on to Britain and remained here.

It was in vain that Helvidius denied the perpetual virginity of the Lord's mother; in vain Jovinian wrote against the superiority of the state of virginity in comparison with that of marriage. Vigilantius met with no success in his protest against the widespread adoration of relics which he held to be a relapse into heathenism. Jerome won the day, but it was due to the natural trend of public opinion at the beginning of the fifth century and afterwards rather than to personal influence of his own.

As we shall see in the next chapter, Prosper says that the Bishop of Rome sent Germanus of Auxerre to Britain as his representative (*vice sua*) for the suppression of Pelagianism, and two years later ordained Palladius and sent him also to the Irish to be their first bishop. These statements raise questions which affect the criticism of the sources from which the materials for the reconstruction of the history are drawn. In England there has been a tendency to look upon Prosper as biased. Even Mr. Bradshaw, who compiled a part of vol. i of Haddan and Stubbs's *Councils*, says on p. 18: 'Prosper, as he evidently in his *Contra Collatorem* exaggerates the temporal, so it may fairly be supposed in his *Chronicle* exaggerates the spiritual, power of the Popes at that time in Britain.' On p. 25 also, referring to the legendary accounts of Lucius and Eleutherus, he adds: 'They were manifestly written in the time and tone of Prosper, with the spirit of whose notices of the missions of Germanus and Palladius in 429 and 431 they precisely tally.' Words from another chronicle might be added, viz. the British *Annales Cambriae*, in which, opposite 'the year 453', is set the notice: 'Easter Sunday is changed in compliance with Leo, Bishop of Rome.' I have endeavoured in a subsequent chapter to set forth the real intention of the compiler of the *Annales Cambriae*, or, as I am strongly inclined to call the

chronicle, the *Annales Brittonum*. It will be clearly evident that Leo the Great in the year 455 was actually giving directions to Britain, as part of the ancient imperial diocese of *Galliae*, with respect to uniformity in the observance of Easter, and the Church of Britain joined all the other Churches of the West in obeying his direction.

It is not necessary to consider any statements affirming or denying the supremacy of the Roman bishop in the West. No one need be apprehensive of conceding to the Roman See too much authority over Britain during the first half of the fifth century,[1] for the words of Prosper, whether in his work against Cassian (*c. Collatorem*), or in his chronicle, do not necessarily attribute to the Roman bishop any more than was allowed at Arles, or may be read in other contemporary records.

The Church at Rome had, for a long period, been regarded as possessing a decisive spiritual pre-eminence, and by means of the influence it possessed it had exercised, far and wide, that authority which naturally results from such influence. The force of circumstances tended so to enhance this authority that to the minds of many the claim that it was obligatory seemed perfectly justifiable. The Roman bishop was the most important and influential of all bishops, so that, for this reason alone, *he might be asked to do what no other could*, by publishing and recommending what had been decided by the Council itself.[2] Such an attitude approaches very near to that of accepted authority.

The canons of the Synod of Sardica[3] appear to go con-

[1] See Rees, *Welsh Saints*, p. 120. Several have followed him.

[2] 'Placuit etiam, a te *qui maiores dioiceses* tenes, per te potissimum omnibus insinuari:'—these words came after the decisions of the Council. Also: 'Quid decrevimus communi consilio, caritati tuae significavimus, ut omnes sciant, quid in futurum observare debeant,' Hefele, i. 201 ff.

[3] Canons 3 and 7 of Sardica, A.D. 344. 'If any one of the bishops has been judged in any cause, and thinks that he has a good case that a second Council should be called, (it was decided) that we honour the memory of St. Peter the apostle, so that letters shall be written by those who have examined the case, to Julius, Bishop of Rome, and if he decide that the judgement should be reopened, let it be reopened and let him appoint judges,' Can. 3.

'If a bishop has been accused and the bishops of his district have

siderably beyond this. They presuppose a case of appeal to Julius, the then Bishop of Rome, and his prerogative to reopen cases which are to be retried by bishops chosen by him. In the last resort he may delegate his authority to his legates, who, sitting as coadjutors with the bishops that retry the case, will give judgement. Still this is all contingent upon his being *asked* to do so. And while great authority is implied by these two canons, that authority was regarded not as absolute but *conferred*, and in its widest scope had no reference whatever to the case of Britain or Ireland in 429 and 431.

But the Roman Church by the time of Siricius (384–98) had advanced greatly in importance. With him begin the so-called *decretals*. The first decretal refers to Himerius, the Bishop of Tarragona in Spain, and makes serious demands with respect to 'the statutes of the Apostolic See'. This importance was increased by the activities of a series of strong capable men with a gift for administration, chief of whom was Leo the Great. The East had taken a position of its own in canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon, which claimed for the Church of Constantinople equality with that of Rome; moreover, the special supremacy of Rome, though now far beyond that defined by the canons of Sardica, was, for the most part, and especially in the more western countries, limited to cases of appeal, or to requests for confirmation of judgements already given. The Roman bishops themselves, however high their claims, proceeded with great tact, until at last, in an abrupt and not to say repulsive form, the Edict of Valentinian III, the most worthless of emperors, conferred legally on Leo more than

collectively decided to eject him from his office, if the ejected one appeal and betake himself to the Bishop of Rome and desires that he be heard: (it was decided that) if he (the Roman bishop) consider it just that the decree should be reopened and a fresh examination made, he shall write to those bishops who are in the boundary and the neighbouring province, so that they shall reinvestigate all carefully and give their decision faithfully. That, if he who asks for his case to be reheard move the Roman bishop to send a presbyter *de latere suo*, it shall be within the power of the bishop to do what he decides and thinks best,' Can. 7.

the bishop's own decretals, with their wiser and more measured language, had ever claimed.[1]

In this century a great controversy could agitate the mind of the West almost without touching that of the East. The Greek Church had two great doctrines—first, the doctrine of God, including that of the Person of Christ and of the Holy Spirit; and second, the doctrine of the Incarnation. Beyond these no great addition was made to definite teaching, though the doctrine of man also finds a place in the views, for instance, of Athanasius in his discussion of the redemptive purpose of the Son's incarnation.[2] In Augustine, however, while the *De Trinitate* is in its own sphere the peer of any Greek work in grasp of thought, the West is carried to other departments of doctrine by the power of a strong many-sided intellect. In him the doctrine of the Church appears infinitely rich in comparison with the almost entirely practical form which it had taken in Cyprian two hundred years earlier. His deep meditations on human nature led him to emphasize original sin; and over against this he sets the doctrine of Divine supernatural aid through Grace, thinking that Grace must be irresistible in order to be thoroughly helpful to the helpless, and he is led to formulate a doctrine of predestination. He was not conscious that predestination lessened the need of strenuous effort on the part of any Christian, while it brought consolation and help to those who felt the struggle of life to be very real, with its entire dependence on God, from whom all good comes.

The intellectual activity of the Church is further estimated by the protest of Pelagius against some of the doctrines of

[1] On this complex subject, where the temper alike of peoples and Churches has to be taken into consideration as well as the bare words of decretals and laws, the following works may be consulted:—

Gore, *The Roman Claims.* Puller, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, especially Lecture V. Bingham's *Antiquities.* Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, vol. iii. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht*, 350–440. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums.* Father Hurter's Introduction to Cyprian's *Epistolae* and *De Unitate*, to Leo's *Epistolae*, and to Selected Works of Augustine. Many other works might, of course, be named.

[2] St. Athanasii, *De Incarnatione.*

Augustine, more especially his denial of freedom of the will, and his view involved in the doctrine of infant baptism as a rite for the remission of sin.[1]

[1] Against quite another part of the great African teacher's system was opposition kindled in Marseilles, Arles, and Lerins, and that among men who accepted fully the doctrine of the Fall, which was denied by Pelagius. Their protest was against statements in the last works of Augustine, which maintained that Grace was irresistible as well as prevenient, and led to an extreme doctrine of predestination. We shall find this doctrine as well as the real 'Pelagian' doctrine in Britain.

CHAPTER XIII

PELAGIANISM

Pelagius. Agricola and Severianus. Palladius

This chapter is not intended to be, nor ought it primarily to be, a discussion of a controversy, but the life-history of a man, or rather of a group of men. The four whose names appear above as the subject of the chapter were, I believe, of this island, but the only way to arrive at a true perspective of their and their country's relation to the wider history of religion is to understand those conceptions and motives which carried the first of them into controversy with the greatest thinker of their age and of many succeeding ages. This cannot be secured except by extending the sphere of our survey, nor can we even adequately understand what Pelagianism in Britain meant, without that same widening of views. There was no Pelagian controversy until A.D. 412. After 415 it aroused great bitterness; in 418 we lose sight of Pelagius, and by the early twenties of the century the agitation had died out in most places. The controversy convulsed Africa and Italy for a time; but Gaul and Britain seem to have been almost untouched by it. Then came the great mistake, so often repeated age after age—the issue of imperial edicts, the proscription and banishment of men for the views they hold in religion. Repressive measures, involving exile, were put into execution against men of Pelagian views, and lasted until beyond 422. It was these hard measures, to my mind, that caused the appearance of Agricola and Severianus on the stage of history, and, indirectly, of Palladius and Germanus of Auxerre.

The following list of the sources from which our history is to be drawn, without pretending to be exhaustive, will, I believe, prove sufficient for our purpose:—

S. Augustini Opera, but especially vol. x of Migne's edition, t. 44, 45. References to other parts of Augustine's works will be found here. The very titles of the writings are suggestive of the lines along which the controversy ran; in the first part, On the Merits and the Remission of Sins, On the Spirit and the Letter, On Nature and Grace, On the Perfection of Righteousness in Man, On the Proceedings against Pelagius, On the Grace of Christ and Original Sin, On Marriage, On the Soul and its Origin, Against two Epistles of the Pelagians, Six Books against Julian of Eclanum, On Grace and Free Will, On Corruption and Grace, On the Predestination of the Saints. Then in the second part, On the Gift of Perseverance, &c. The three last-named works are of first-class importance in the final portion of the story of this controversy. Very full quotations from other writings, bearing on Pelagius and the controversy into which he, along with his outspoken friend, the Irishman Coelestius, was drawn about A. D. 411, and later systematized by the genius of Julian, bishop of the Italian city of Eclanum, are collected in this tenth volume (*Appendicis Pars secunda*, col. 1679). The following are noticed separately:—

(1) *Gennadius* of Marseilles wrote, about 491, a series of short biographies in continuation of a similar work by Jerome, generally printed with the latter under the one title *De Viris illustribus*. Chapters 43 and 45 are devoted to Pelagius and Coelestius. The best edition is that by Richardson in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. xiv.

(2) *Marius Mercator*, a layman, who may have been from the province of Africa and known to Augustine, but was at Rome about 418, and at Constantinople some ten years afterwards. A zealous student of theology, an Augustinian to the core, he wrote several works on the men and the controversy. Some of these are lost. Of those still extant, there are two particularly noteworthy; each of them is called a *Commonitorium*: (a) *Comm. super nomine Coelestii*, written in Greek and Latin; (b) *Comm. adversus haeresin Pelagii et Coelestii*, written between 428 and 431, intended chiefly for Eastern readers.

(3) *The writings of Jerome*; in particular, Commentary on Jeremiah in three books written about 415; also Dialogues on the Pelagians in three books, written during the same year. This work, as well as the Commentary, *were known in Britain to Gildas* about 120 years later, as the quotations he makes from them show.

(4) *Orosius*, a Spaniard by birth, who was attracted to Africa by the fame of Augustine. Sent by his master to Jerome at Bethlehem, he arrived at Jerusalem when the Pelagian controversy was rousing the interest of thinking men in those parts. Pelagius had wandered thither, and a Synod held at Jerusalem in 415, hesitating to condemn, acquitted him of the charge of heresy. Respecting the proceedings of this Synod, Orosius wrote his *Liber Apologeticus de Arbitrii Libertate*—Book of Defence respecting Freedom of the Will (415).

(5) *Pelagius*: Commentary on thirteen Pauline Epistles; Epistle to

Demetrias, a virgin, on her intention to become a nun, vol. x of *S. Aug. Opera* (Migne); *Confession of Faith sent to Innocent I* (Hahn's *Bibliothek*); *De Natura et Gratia; De Libero Arbitrio.* The last two are not extant.

(6) *Prosper Tiro* of Aquitaine. Migne, tome 51, contains the parts to which reference will be made here: the *Epistola ad Augustinum* (Ep. 225); the poem *De Ingratis*; the work against John Cassian, *Contra Collatorem*; some *Epigrammata*; a *Chronicle*, found in *Chronica Minora*, i, Mommsen's edition, vol. ix of *Mon. Germaniae Hist.*; Ebert (*Allg. Geschichte der Litt.*, i. 365) finds reason to conclude that there were three editions of the *Chronicle*: (1) of events down to 433, (2) of events to 445, (3) of events to 455. Mommsen believes there were five editions: (1) in 433, (2) in 443, (3) in 445, (4) in 451, (5) in 455; the *Chronicle* is a continuation of Jerome's work of the same kind. Prosper is known as a native of Aquitaine who was attracted to Marseilles before 428, the year in which he wrote his letter to Augustine, and probably became a presbyter there. His burning zeal for the Augustinian teaching is very apparent. The *Contra Collatorem* seems to me to show signs of no small intellectual grasp and compass. Though bitter in tone against the Pelagians, there is, for the most part, a fine reserve shown towards his Gallic opponents, afterwards called Semi-Pelagians. He wished to convert them, but did not succeed. The poem *De Ingratis* contains a number of lines which well express some exceedingly pertinent ideas.

It is important to keep in mind that Prosper and his friend Hilary visited Rome before the death of Pope Caelestine, in 432, to solicit his aid against the Semi-Pelagians. Afterwards he settled at Rome, perhaps from about 434, and, as Gennadius tells us (*De Vir. ill.* 85), entered into the service of Leo the Great. Thus, *even before the first part of his Chronicle was completed*, he had every opportunity of availing himself of all the information procurable at Rome.

We are obliged to leave unnoticed the remainder of the rich collection in vol. x of Migne's *S. Aug. Opera* of extracts from Papal rescripts, imperial edicts, Libelli, Epistolae, Acts of Councils, all witnesses of the tumult of feeling, and the vastness of the issues raised in the controversy which followed the departure of Pelagius and Coelestius, Briton and Irishman, from Rome about 410–11.

If, for a moment, we look back to the days of Theodosius the Great (379–95), we are reminded how eventful they proved to be for the Empire and the world, both in the

affairs of the State and in the progressive advance of ideas and institutional movements within the Church. Different parts of the great empire had never been so closely in touch with one another as at this period, and during the succeeding period, that which immediately preceded its dissolution in the West. But what is equally remarkable is the fact that the energetic life of the Church as shown in the closeness of the ties which bound together her most distant members outstripped the empire and survived it.

It was during these years of Theodosius that this man of British origin seems to have left his native island, as others from Gaul and Spain did, to travel in Eastern lands. Now, Pelagius was only one of many Latin Christians of the West, who about A.D. 380—most of them as pilgrims, but many also as seekers for a more advanced training in the Scriptures and the faith of the Church—had begun to visit the sacred sites mentioned in Holy Writ. But a new attraction had by now arisen in the countries which were famous and held sacred because of the new discipline—that discipline which had proved so efficacious to contemporary saints in their spiritual conflicts. Syria and Palestine were still regarded as sacred, but Egypt, with its record of the severe saintliness of Paul, Antony, Macarius, and Pachomius, attracted men and women who would be their imitators. The *Historica Lausiaca* [1] informs us that men of this type from Britain were entertained by the hospitality of Melania at Jerusalem. We have reason to mention the travels of Jerome to Antioch (374), his hermit life in the desert of Syria (374–9), his stay at Constantinople before he returned to Rome in 382; also the solitary life of Rufinus on the Mount of Olives, his journeyings to Egypt (371–97), and return to Rome in 398. How the knowledge thus gained of the Greek tongue and its Christian literature enriched the West, needs no telling. Reference to pilgrimages to Palestine and Egypt made by others, viz. by Silvia or Egeria, Cassian, and Postumian, have already been made. We bring Pelagius into line with these wanderers to the East, as one who left his native Britain on

[1] *The Lausiac History of Palladius*, i, ii; edited by Dom Cuthbert Butler. Vol. vi of *Texts and Studies* (1904, 1906, Cambridge).

a journey such as theirs. He was drawn by the same desire to see and know the Monachism which was then captivating the souls of Westerns, and, like Jerome and Rufinus, acquired a knowledge of the Greek tongue with its rich Christian literature. He is described as a cultured layman, grave and serious of character, monk also, though remaining a layman. We possess records of his life for a period of about eighteen years (400–18). The references found in his own works and in other writers between 412 and 418 imply that he had reached a ripe maturity of life before he became famous. The *Commentary* written at Rome (400–10) presupposes a knowledge of Greek Exegesis, and the fact that in two Synods, Jerusalem (415) and Diospolis (415), he was able to defend himself in Greek, whereas his accusers required interpreters, suggests a long residence in Eastern countries.[1]

When Pelagius first drew considerable attention to himself, we are probably right in concluding that he had already long passed middle life. But of his life previous to c. 400 we can only conjecture, though of his life as a monk, who became a heresiarch, some improbable, and not a few impossible, assertions have been advanced. Of the former class is the statement that his birthplace was Ireland, the objective being the explanation of certain very striking Irish facts of a later date: to the latter belongs what has been asserted by a legion of English and Welsh writers from John Leland onwards, that he was trained at the monastery of Bangor-is-y-Coed in Flintshire.[2]

We may safely urge that Pelagius left his native place, 'Bangor,' some few generations before 'Bangor' came into existence; moreover, it is impossible to believe that he

[1] Dr. Swete, in his edition of the *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Minor Epistles of S. Paul*, refers to 'the relation which Theodore's commentary bears to the brief notes now generally ascribed to Pelagius'. Origen he regards as a probable common source, though the problem implies more than such a borrowing. Vol. i, pp. lxxiv–lxxvi.

[2] Even the Benedictine editors say: 'Utrum vero monachum in Anglia *apud Bangorenses* vel in Italia induerit Pelagius statuere hic non magni refert.' A French writer of 1901 speaks of 'Pélage, moine de Bangor au pays de Galles'.

acquired in Ireland the knowledge of Greek displayed at Jerusalem and Diospolis. Equally impertinent is the implication conveyed by a phrase employed in the Welsh version of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Anglican Church (Art. IX), that his fellow country men called Pelagius *Morgan*.[1] Probably there may be in the very confused notions of the *hûd Morien* (deceit of Morien), given in the Iolo MSS., the reminiscence of some attempt to mould a British form for his name,[2] with the connotation of 'born near the sea', or 'sea-born'. Thus did the writer of that Chronicle of the Iolo MSS. coin the form *Morien* as what he conceived to be the British equivalent for the Latin *Pelagius*, but the older Britons would not have done this, any more than they would have used Bleiddian for Lupus as the name of the Bishop of Troyes. They would simply have borrowed the Latin name, which would then, by constant use, have undergone some change consonant with tendencies at work in their language; thus Dubricius becomes Dyfrig, Patricius Padrig, and Pelagius might have become Pelag, or Peleg.[3]

The birthplace of Pelagius is, in a way, a matter of no consequence whatever, as far as the opinions he held are concerned, still it is but right that it should be discussed in order to appreciate afterwards the use to which the decision of the question may possibly lead. On the one hand is the belief that Pelagius started his travels from Britain, his

[1] This appears, I believe, *for the first time* in the emended version of *Ellis Wynne*, which was published in 1710. The first and other versions have not employed the term; theirs is *Pelagiaid*. *Morgan*, it is known, is *Morgant* or *Morcant*.

[2] Iolo MSS., pp. 42, 43. 'Morien ap Argad Fardd . . . ac hûd Morien a fu un o dri hûd ddargoll Ynys Prydain.' The date is given as about 380; Constantine's date is also placed *c.* 390; and St. Martin opposes the *hûd Morien*: Theodosius the Great is placed in *c.* 410; but the reference to the coming of 'Garmon Sant o dir Gâl, a chydag ef Bleiddian Sant, i adnewyddu Bedydd ac Aberth a Chrêd gyfiawn ar y ffydd', shows that the writer had Pelagianism in mind when he wrote of *hûd Morien*. Morien would be a later form of Morgen (born by the sea), where *gen* is Celtic corresponding to γεν- in ἐ-γεν-όμην and in *gen*-us, signifying *birth*.

[3] *Morien* appears in the Black Book of Carmarthen, but can in no way refer to Pelagius.

native land; on the other hand, two expressions used by Jerome, along with certain other facts which are observable in the background, have led Dr. Zimmer to take the view that Pelagius must have been an Irishman. 'His chief adversary, Jerome,' he says, 'in two places expressly describes him as Irish. . . . A sincere and earnest thinker, Pelagius did not adopt heretical views until he came to Rome, about the year A.D. 400. But if he did come from a Christian monastery in the south-east of Ireland, he would, as a matter of course, take care that his works reached home. . . . Natural partiality for their learned fellow countryman would unconsciously influence the Irish, even in later times. It could not but enhance the renown of the Irish monasteries of the end of the fourth century that they should have produced a champion capable of defending himself in Greek at the Synod of Jerusalem in A.D. 415.'[1]

We have, I believe, no knowledge whatever, nor can have, of monasteries in the south-east of Ireland 'about the end of the fourth century', and, though it be granted that there may have been Christians in Ireland before St. Patrick, it is extremely hazardous to suppose the existence of monasteries there at so early a date. But let us look at what the contemporaries of Pelagius say. St. Augustine, in a letter to Paulinus, speaks of him as *Brito*; Orosius in the *Liber Apologeticus* calls him *Britannus noster*; Marius Mercator styles him *gente Britannus monachus*; Prosper Tiro's *Chronicle* mentions him in the year 410, *eodem tempore Pelagius Brito*; Gennadius' first words in his chapter of biography are *Pelagius Brito heresiarches*.[2]

[1] 'Keltische Kirche' in *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, vol. x, 3rd edition. The Article has been published in English by David Nutt, *The Celtic Church in Britain and Ireland. Pelagius in Irland*, by the same author, while bringing to our knowledge a remarkable discovery—nothing less, in Dr. Zimmer's view, than the very Commentary itself on the Pauline Epistles written by Pelgius—similarly assumes that he was an Irishman, but without cogent proof; the hypothesis is not convincing.

[2] Jerome began to mention him about 415 in the Prologue to his Commentary on Jeremiah, and in the three books of Dialogues against the Pelagians written in the same year; the *Ep. ad Ctesiphontem* was

Jerome, in the Prologue to Book I of the Commentary, rages against Pelagius as a 'perfect dullard excessively heavy by his Irish pottage' ('stolidissimus et Scottorum pultibus praegravatus'), a description that may be taken to agree with the picture of him as a big-bodied, broad-shouldered man, given by Orosius (*Liber Apol.* 37). Orosius, who was at Bethlehem with Jerome the very year he wrote these words (415), and is equally abusive, nevertheless calls him a Briton. It may be that the companionship and bold speaking of the eloquent Irish agitator Coelestius had something to do with Jerome's questionable attribution of Irish extraction to Pelagius. Judging by other notices of Ireland in his works, the most defamatory abuse he could heap upon him was to call him an Irishman. The Prologue to Book III of the same Commentary supplies the quotation upon which the conclusion that Pelagius was an Irishman is generally based, yet even this, when the whole paragraph is read, turns out, as I understand it, to be confirmatory of the other view. The detailed evidence from which this conclusion is argued I subjoin in a note below.[1]

preparatory to these. By 420 Jerome had died; but Augustine had begun to write against Pelagius and Pelagianism about 412, continuing to do so at intervals until about 430. These facts in themselves show who was the 'chief adversary'.

[1] The Prologue in question affirms of Pelagius: 'Pacem pollicetur, ut graviora bella exerceat: ridet ut mordeat . . . Hic tacet, alibi criminatur . . .'; then proceeds: 'ipseque mutus latrat per alpinum (other reading, *albinum*) canem, grandem et corpulentem, et qui calcibus magis possit saevire quam dentibus; *habet enim progeniem Scotticae gentis, de Britannorum vicinia*: qui iuxta fabulas poetarum, instar Cerberi, spirituali percutiendus est clava, ut aeterno cum suo magistro Plutone silentio conticescat.' Migne, *P. L.*, tome 24, col. 758. It is the italicized words alone that Zimmer gives, and the same is true of many other writers. The whole passage may be translated as follows: 'Mute himself, he (Pelagius) does his barking by means of an alpine dog (Coelestius), huge and big of body, which can be more furious with its heels than with its teeth: for it has its lineage of the Irish breed from the neighbourhood of the Britons, which, like Cerberus, according to the fables of the poets, must be smitten with a spiritual cudgel, that, along with its master Pluto, it may become silent with eternal silence.' Here, apparently, the one that has

Certain features in the character of Pelagius himself must have caused the men by whom he is mentioned to regard him as a man of Britain. The references, indirect for the most part, imply that there was something singular in the idea held by them of Britain in relation to doctrine. Perhaps Britain was regarded as a place likely to produce a Pelagius.

Marius Mercator's account states that Pelagius wrote a *Commentary* in Rome, during the time of Pope Anastasius (368–401), on thirteen of the Pauline Epistles, from which Marius quotes condemnatory passages.[1] About 410 he left Rome in company with Coelestius before the sack of the city by Alaric.

The *Commentary* is mentioned by Augustine as consisting of 'short notes' on the thirteen Epistles (the Epistle to the Hebrews was not included); other writers also quote from it. It is interesting to know that the evidence is so ample of this British layman and monk, whose strictness and elevation of character as well as intellectual power and learning were far-famed. He was the writer, not probably of the first, but certainly of the second *Commentary* to be written in Latin on the Epistles of St. Paul. The acceptance by the Church of this work under other names —e.g. those of Pope Gelasius, Jerome, Primasius, and

Irish lineage is the one compared to Cerberus; it is the 'dog', i.e. Coelestius, not the 'master, Pluto', who must represent Pelagius. We thus find a reason for the addition *de Britannorum vicinia*; the dog is an Irish dog from the neighbourhood of the Britons, whence his master comes.

'O! te felicem cuius praeter discipulos nemo conscribit libros, ut quidquid videris displicere, non tuum, sed alienum esse contendat'—so writes Jerome in the third book of the Dialogues against the Pelagians, implying: 'You are a crafty fellow, Pelagius; you let others write and talk, keeping your own tongue quiet!' But if our interpretation of this second passage, where Pelagius is mentioned by Jerome, be correct, and it seems to me the only possible one, then the 'Irish pottage' which, according to the first, 'weighs heavy' on dull Pelagius (who was very stout), may also be understood of the aid rendered him by his companion Coelestius. Thus all our evidence respecting Pelagius becomes uniform; he was, we may infer, not an Irishman.

[1] *Commonitorium*, tome x, coll. 1681–8 (Migne).

Hilary—its long and singular popularity in Ireland, and in Irish convents on the Continent, the probable discovery of the original at St. Gall by himself;—all this and more is well told by Dr. Zimmer in his important work, *Pelagius in Irland.* We mark also that Augustine refers to his acquaintance with Cyprian, and his reverent use of the *Testimoniorum Liber* ('cum debito honore commemorat') written by that African bishop.[1]

Gennadius, in c. 43 of the *De Viris Illustribus*, though he does not mention the *Commentary*, names other works of Pelagius written 'before he came forth as a heretic'. These are, *Three Books on the Trinity*, and a *Book of Select Passages from Holy Scripture* drawn up under chapter headings 'after the manner of St. Cyprian' for the practical purpose of aiding Christian conduct. We cannot but feel that the career of such a man as Pelagius demonstrates the important fact that the Church of the Britons was now closely related to Catholic Christendom in the West at a time when the empire was ceasing to be that unifying power which it had been in the past, and probably involves the further point that Britain was then regarded as the home of a distinctive type of Christianity.

The peculiar features of Augustinian teaching had already taken marked form in writings that belong to a time soon after the consecration of Augustine as Bishop of Hippo (395). Most of us, however, are acquainted with the *Confessions*, and some would say that the best 'Augustinianism' is to be sought in that book, where he pours forth his praise and adoration before God, in the feeling that God had been seeking him and drawing him, when *he* as yet had not been seeking God. Thus he framed his doctrine of Divine Grace anticipating and conquering the sin that is in man: the universality of sin in the race led him to emphasize the doctrine which he regarded as particularly Pauline, the Fall in Adam, or Original Sin: it was in the train of these that the doctrines of Election and of Perseverance in Grace came. It is true that the full precision of form and statement was not evolved until a later period, and was

[1] 'Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum', iv. 21.

not complete until serious dissension, not unmingled with admiration, rose in the neighbourhood of Marseilles and Lerins in South Gaul.[1]

Now Pelagianism was a reaction and a protest against these fundamental doctrines, and was evolved in the mind of a man who desired, above all, that serious *effort* should be made to carry out the ascetic rigour of self-discipline. His bent was practical, learned though he was. Thus he arrived at a denial of original sin, at a differing view of Grace, and an assertion of Free Will which held that man has in himself the power 'to sin or not to sin'. Baptism of infants also, as being a sacrament of regeneration, for the removal of the curse of original sin, loomed large among the points in dispute. The controversy proper began in 411 and came to an end, so far as Pelagius was concerned, in 418.

It is difficult to accept the position taken up by Prof. Bury with regard to the fundamental issue between Pelagius and Augustine. 'Pelagius,' he says, 'was the champion of human nature as such, which the Christian Church, in pursuance of its high objects, dishonoured and branded as essentially depraved. . . . Pelagius attempted to rescue the dignity of human nature; . . . he stimulated thinking men in the West, and induced many to modify their views about Free Will and congenital sin.' But it was not Pelagius, as Bury suggests, who stimulated Cassian, Vincent, and Faustus, and whatever may be our presuppositions on the questions in dispute, viz. on Free Will and sin, the view put forward in the quotation given above can hardly be regarded, from the historical point of view, as a true account of the controversy. There were

[1] It must be remembered here that Augustinianism, in the matter of Predestination, is the same doctrine as appeared afterwards in Thomas Aquinas and John Calvin. Calvin, to those who have read carefully Book III of the *Institutio*, is nowhere less original than where he treats of this doctrine, as is seen by his piling of quotation upon quotation from St. Augustine. This view respecting the relation of these great teachers is put forward strongly by Dr. Mozley, *Predestination*, pp. 252 ff., 413–29.

'thinking men' of that age 'in the West', and there are some in our own time to whom the Pelagian position appears to be outside the domain of religion, if it is not actually irreligious.

Augustine first refers to Pelagius in the book on *The Merits and Remission of Sin* addressed to Count Marcellinus and written in 412. The Briton and his Irish friend Coelestius had landed at Hippo quite unexpectedly, where no one knew them, but as Augustine was then at Carthage taking part in a great Conference held with the Donatists, they departed for Carthage. Here it was that Augustine first saw the man with whom his name was to be associated for years, nay for ages, to come. After this, Pelagius departed for the East, but was soon on his trial at the two Synods of Jerusalem and Diospolis (415). The African Father, in answer to many inquiries, wrote the book above named, to which he also refers in his *Retractationes* (c. 33). 'And here,' he says, 'the chief discussion is respecting the baptism of infants on account of original sin, and respecting the grace of God by which we are justified. . . . In these books I thought it best to refrain from naming them (Pelagius and Coelestius) . . . nay in the Third Book, which is a letter, . . . I placed the name of Pelagius not without praise.' And so we find it. Pelagius is reported to be a 'holy man', 'an advanced Christian', 'a good man much spoken of' (x. 185–8). *At Rome and other parts Pelagius had many friends*, yet even at Rome he had not hesitated to express his dissent from Augustine. A characteristic story is told us by Augustine himself of an African bishop reading, at Rome, in Pelagius's hearing, parts of the *Confessions* (written 397–400), soon after they were published, and when there was no Pelagian Controversy. As he read the well-known words: 'Give what Thou commandest and command what Thou wilt' ('Da quod iubes, et iube quod vis'), Pelagius became excited and would have quarrelled with the reciter, saying, 'I cannot bear it' (x. 1691). To the practical Briton this power to obey was something not to be given, but to be *gained* by strict discipline of soul; he did not perceive what the other, greater than he, exercising

too a no less strict self-discipline and exacting it in others as a law of life, felt and expressed of the fuller obedience to which the Divine gift lent a more sublime possibility of realization. Men of the type of Pelagius are generally respected by virtue of their regular earnest life. Similarly the letter which Pelagius wrote from the East to a virgin named Demetrias, then at Rome and intending to become a nun, seems full of the wise, practical, exacting, religious temper such as would make him respected, though Augustine found in it the poison which restricts the grace of God.[1] Yet such men, respected though they be, may not know how

> The rapturous moment
> Approaches, and earth's best endowment
> Blends with heaven's. (Browning, *Christmas Eve.*)

After Diospolis, in 416, Pelagius wrote a work on Free Will in four books, *De Libero Arbitrio* (see Migne, tome x, coll. 379, 380), and in 417 sent to Innocent, the Bishop of Rome, a Creed which, owing to his death, was received by Zosimus. This finely expressed Creed (printed in Hahn's *Bibliothek*, pp. 288–92) was for long attributed strangely enough to Augustine and to Jerome by transcribers and editors. The 'Caroline Books' even add: 'This is the true whole (integritas) of the Catholic faith of tradition, which, with sincere heart, we believe and confess.' The reading of it, Zosimus informs the African bishops, brought tears to many eyes. Pelagius thus had friends, including the bishop even, at Rome in 417. The last we hear of the man is in 418, after the great Council at Carthage, which in eight celebrated chapters condemned his teaching. In the autumn of that year Augustine wrote the *De Gratia Christi*, addressed to Albina, her son Pinianus, and Melania, in answer to a letter which they had sent, probably from Jerusalem, favouring Pelagius on the ground of statements he personally had made to them respecting the constant need of God's grace 'in every act of ours'.

As to how long he may have lived after 418 we have no

[1] *De Gratia Christi*, c. 40, tome x. col. 378. The *Epistola ad Dem.* ii. 1115.

knowledge, but in this last glimpse of him we see him still a pilgrim.

Pelagians seem to have been numerous even at Rome and in Africa, but Pelagianism was now a lost cause. Three important Councils in Africa had condemned it; four Bishops of Rome, Innocent, Zosimus (after a period of apparent indecision), Boniface, and Caelestine, had confirmed the condemnation; three imperial rescripts or edicts had been issued against it by 421. These repeated edicts of the secular power prove that there were Pelagians whose strong tenacity would not submit to ecclesiastical censure. The Edict addressed in 421 to Volusianus, the city prefect, declares that they are to be 'exiled at once from Rome, in such a way that they must not be found nearer the city than the hundredth milestone'. Prosper Tiro says in the *Contra Collatorem* that Boniface (418–22) had 'used not only apostolic means, but also imperial edicts against the enemies of the grace of God. . . . Caelestine (422–32), also, had commanded that they were to be thrust out of all Italy'. Then follows, and this is significant, the reference to Britain, 'nor with slower care did he free Britain of the same plague.'[1]

I am inclined to connect the introduction of Pelagianism into Britain with these severe edicts of exile promulgated in the name of the emperor and Caelestine, the Bishop of Rome. A man known by report to Prosper, Agricola, when exiled, betook himself to Britain, probably his native place, from whence, in order to preserve it as a Catholic island, Caelestine again bestirred himself, *nec segniore cura*, to oust him. Certain men that were 'enemies of grace', Prosper adds, had taken possession of the land of their birth and from that remote part of Ocean were removed by Caelestine.[2] Such

[1] The Edict of 421: Migne, *August.*, tome 10, coll. 1750. Prosper Tiro, Migne, tome 51, coll. 270, 271: 'inimici gratiae Dei' is often used by both Augustine and Prosper for the Pelagians.

[2] 'Nec vero segniore cura ab hoc eodem morbo Britannias liberavit, quando quosdam inimicos gratiae solum suae originis occupantes etiam ab illo secreto exclusit Oceani,' *Contra Coll.* 21, 22.

probably were Severian and his son Agricola. The *Chronicle* for the year 429 records:

In the consulship of Florentius and Dionysius, Agricola, a Pelagian, son of Bishop Severianus, a Pelagian, corrupts the Churches of Britain by the secret inculcation of his doctrine. But at the suggestion of the deacon Palladius, Bishop (or Pope) Caelestine sends Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, as his representative, and he, after the heretics had been cast down, guides the Britons to the Catholic faith.

'Florentio et Dionysio coss. (= A.D. 429).

'Agricola Pelagianus, Severiani episcopi Pelagiani filius, ecclesias Brittaniae dogmatis sui insinuatione corrumpit, sed ad insinuationem Palladi diaconi papa Coelestinus Germanum Autisiodorensiem episcopum vice sua mittit et deturbatis hereticis Britannos ad catholicam fidem dirigit.'

Another reading gives *ad actionem Palladii*, Mommsen, *Chronica Minora*, p. 472.

No other writer gives us any information respecting three of these men, but, as Prosper wrote or revised his *Chronicle* after his visit to Rome in 432, it seems natural to infer that it was there he acquired his information respecting them: two, the Pelagian father and son, would be known as prominent among those 'enemies of grace' who had been driven into exile, and the third, the deacon Palladius, remained at Rome, until he was ordained by the same Caelestine as orthodox bishop for 'the Irish who believed in Christ'.

The three may well be regarded as Britons who had, just like Pelagius himself, wandered from religious motives to Rome, there to find themselves in the midst of this controversy. The British bishop Severian and his son Agricola were drawn to take sides with Pelagius, along with many others in Rome: the third, the British deacon, stood firm on the orthodox side, and with patriotic ardour as well as practical thoughtfulness, suggested the best means of extirpating the Pelagianism lately imported into Britain. We need not suppose that he was or had been deacon at Auxerre under Germanus, because, after St. Martin, no man was better known everywhere as a strenuous influential bishop than Germanus. Ireland, in so far as it may have been christianized before St. Patrick, had been converted to

Christianity mainly through the ministration of British missionaries. This much is suggested by the meagre materials available for us. Thus it was in no way new or strange that the 'first bishop' sent to that island should be a Briton.[1]

Returning to the chapter in the *Contra Collatorem* already quoted we read, 'And by ordaining a bishop for the Irish, while he (Caelestine) is zealous to preserve a Roman island Catholic, he also made a barbarian island Christian.'[2] With these words we compare the record for the year 431, which Prosper had been careful to preserve in his *Chronicle*: 'Consulship of Bassus and Antiochus;'—after mentioning the condemnation of Nestorius along with many Pelagians at the Council of Ephesus, he adds: 'Palladius is ordained by Pope Caelestine and is sent to the Irish believers in Christ as their first bishop.'[3]

This Palladius can hardly be any other than the deacon mentioned by Prosper under the year 429 as interested in preventing the spread of the Pelagian heresy in Britain. But it seems to me difficult to believe, as Prof. Bury holds, following Zimmer, that he was sent to Ireland chiefly with the view 'of organizing the small Christian societies there'. 'The choice,' Prof. Bury further says, 'if it was Caelestine's own, was perfectly natural. We must remember that the first and chief consideration of Caelestine was the welfare and orthodoxy of Irish believers, not the conversion of Irish unbelievers.'[4] And yet Prosper distinctly says that 'by

[1] Caspari, in *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten*, p. 385, states firmly his opinion that Palladius was a Briton. 'An der Person des Diakonen Palladius und daran, dass er, der wahrscheinlich ein Brite war, . . . hiefür spricht das nicht geringe Interesse für die britische Kirche, welches seine dringende Aufforderung an Cölestin, ihr zur Hilfe zu kommen . . .' The *Histoire de la lit. de la France* also regards Palladius as a Briton.

[2] 'Et ordinato Scottis episcopo, dum Romanam insulam studet servare catholicam, fecit etiam barbaram Christianam,' c. 21. 2.

[3] 'Basso et Antiocho coss. (= A. D. 431).

'Ad Scottos in Christum credentes ordinatus a papa Caelestino Palladius primus episcopus mittitur,' *Chron. Min.* i. 473.

[4] *Life of St. Patrick*, pp. 52, 54.

'The Bishop of Rome would hardly have sent them a bishop unless they had intimated they wanted one' (p. 52); this idea, suggested by

ordaining a bishop for the Irish he (Caelestine) *made* the barbarian (i.e. non-Roman) island Christian.' Dr. Zimmer is no safe guide here, I believe, when he asks: 'Can this rhetoric of the year 437 suffice to convict the sober chronicler of ignorance concerning what he wrote in 433 about the year 431?' That chapter, though finely phrased, reads to me like a very sober summary of the action taken by the African Councils and the two Popes, Zosimus and Caelestine. Prosper was the same man in 437 as he was in 433, and cannot be taxed with vain rhetoric. He is 'beyond dispute the chief source of historical information for the first half of the fifth century', as Dr. Hodgkin observes.

Palladius the Briton, when he came to Ireland, came to an island which though certainly containing some Christians, yet, taken as a whole, was still heathen. 'He came and went within a year. It is generally assumed that he had not the strength or the tact to deal with the situation, and that his mission was a failure; but our evidence hardly warrants this conclusion. We are told that he proceeded from Ireland to the land of the Picts in North Britain, and died there; but we cannot be sure that he did not intend to return. It is with North Leinster and the hills of Wicklow that tradition associates the brief episode of Palladius. But we may be tempted to suspect that the expedition of Palladius to the country of the Picts was not an abandonment of Ireland, and that it was not the Picts of North Britain, but some Christian communities existing among the Picts of

Zimmer, does not seem to be one that fits the time. The quotation, *nullus inuitis detur episcopus*, belongs to circumstances entirely different. See Langen, *Gesch. der röm. Kirche*, i. s. 801.

Nennius describes Palladius as being sent by Caelestine to *convert* the Irish, so also the *Tripartite Life*: 'ad Scottos in Christum convertendos', so we read in the former (c. 50); 'ad hanc insulam convertendam' is the statement of the latter (ii. 272). Such words, however, must be regarded as simply inaccurate, and the idea of there being two Patricks is equally untenable; 'the other Patrick' is mentioned in lines 65, 66 of St. Fiacc's Hymn, and in the Notes is named Sen Patrick (*Liber Hymnorum*, i. 103; ii. 35). This, however, is simply the view of Palladius taken by Irishmen writing long after Muirchu and Tirechan when they became acquainted with Prosper's *Chronicle*.

Dalaradia in North Ireland, who were the objects of his concern.'[1]

To sum up our information as to the history of these two, both Britons, one was a layman and the first British monk known to history. We have seen him travelling to the East, returning to Rome, then wandering to Africa and the East again, under the stress of a violent controversy, dying there, apparently, soon after 418. The other, a British cleric, who also made his pilgrimage to Rome, and on learning there of the peril to which his mother church was exposed, suggested the means of saving her; from Rome, further, as first bishop he departed for Ireland, to have his work abruptly ended by death about fourteen years after the decease of the fellow countryman whose doctrines he had striven to suppress.

[1] Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*, pp. 54, 55.

CHAPTER XIV

GERMANUS AND LUPUS. GERMANUS AND SEVERUS

On the subject of the present chapter, the following works are important:—

1. Prosper Tiro of Aquitaine, *Chronicle*. Prosper was at Marseilles before A.D. 430, after 434 probably at Rome: printed in Mommsen's *Chronica Minora*, i. p. 343.

2. Constantius of Lyon, *Vita Germani*, written about 480. On this work of Constantius we have a discussion of great value in *Bischof Germanus von Auxerre und die Quellen zu seiner Geschichte* (printed in *Neues Archiv*, xxix. 2, pp. 95–175), by Wilhelm Levison, whose conclusions supplement Schoell's *De Ecclesiastica Britonum Scotorumque Historiae Fontibus*, pp. 24–6.

3. Nennius, *Historia Brittonum*, edited by Mommsen in *Chronica Minora*, iii; a work written twice, (*a*) about A.D. 679, (*b*) about 805–10.

See on it: Zimmer, *Nennius Vindicatus*, and *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* (1897); also *Nennius Retractatus*, by Duchesne, in *Revue Celtique*, xv. 174, where a new text is published.

4. Beda, *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*: Plummer's edition. Book I, cc. 17–21 are from Constantius.

5. *Pelagian Letters*, published by Caspari: *Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten aus den zwei letzten Jahrhunderte des kirchlichen Alterthums und dem Anfang des Mittelalters*. Five anonymous Pelagian letters, two published 'for the first time', and a sermon or tractate on Riches—*De Divitiis*, probably c. 430.

6. *Die Legende des h. Albanus, des Protomartyr Angliae in Texten vor Beda*, by Wilhelm Meyer, reprinted from the *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, 1904.

Before we turn to the chief sources we should pause to consider certain other pieces, published by Caspari, which seem to have a close bearing upon our subject. These consist of five anonymous letters and a tractate or sermon on Riches—*De Divitiis*—all of which the Editor ascribes to the

Agricola mentioned by Prosper as introducing the Pelagian heresy into Britain. The letters, on close examination, bear unmistakable traces of Pelagianism, though, as I think, of so moderate a type as almost to escape the notice of a cursory reader. They are the work of a writer who took to travelling against his father's wish, and who recounts to his father the spiritual gains he has secured, claiming that they fully justify the course he has taken. 'You, dear sir (*dilectio tua*),' he says, addressing his father, 'should not bear it ill that I went away on pilgrimage, since I have, by that pilgrimage, found out the knowledge of truth. Let not my choice grieve you, nor ought my joy to be your sorrow. I have now begun to know how I might be a true Christian. I had previously the desire, but ignorance withstood my vows. . . . If through the dangers of a journey on land, if through the dangers of the sea, I have been kept safe, still greater are those dangers which I have avoided.' He visits Sicily, and there forms the acquaintance of a lady 'of high rank as men count, but far nobler according to God', who opens his eyes in matters of religion and dissuades him from travelling to the East. He goes to Rome. The Pelagian colouring appears in such passages as the following: 'If man has not the power to be without sin, his sin would not be sin, inasmuch as it comes from defect of power (*ex impossibilitate*): defect of power is ascribed to nature, sin, however, is not regarded as a thing of nature but of will, lest the Author of nature be represented as culpable.' Other passages of the same tenor might be given. Caspari argues from this characteristic, and from the reference to a voyage by sea and a long journey by land, that the writer must have come either from North Gaul or from Britain. Britain seems the more likely.[1] He then treats exhaustively of Pelagius, Caelestius, and Fastidius as possible authors, but decides for Agricola. Still we know no more of Agricola than that his father and he were Pelagians, and that the son preached that doctrine in Britain; this can hardly be sufficient ground for ascribing

[1] Probably Western Britain.

the letters and tractate to him.[1] Anyhow we seem justified in regarding these curious relics of Pelagian literature as British.[2] They are interesting also as showing how much of the character of these men is lost to our view when we trust solely to the accounts given by their opponents. It was not at all unlikely that men so genuinely religious as the Pelagians were would attract to themselves many earnest-minded Christians in Britain; neither is there reason for surprise at the fact that those who regarded themselves as of the orthodox or universal faith should fear their coming. Palladius may have known, or may have been apprised of such fear, which fear also may have been the cause of the embassy recorded by Constantius from British bishops to their brethren in Gaul.

The name Germanus (modern Welsh *Garmon*) was common enough before the appearance of this particular Germanus, and after him quite a host of men bore it. Some of those unknown ones built here and there small monasteries, which were called after them. The *Lanna Germani*, the Llan of Garmon, and now known as Llanarmon, was in no case named after the Saint of Auxerre.

With the exception of St. Martin of Tours, there was no bishop more widely known than St. Germanus of Auxerre. One reason of his great fame is the fact that he found in Constantius a biographer of literary gifts equal to those of Sulpicius Severus, the biographer of

[1] Certain words of an epigram of Prosper's, generally applied to Pelagius himself, *appear applicable to Agricola*, or one of his confederates mentioned in the letters and the sermon on Riches, published by Caspari:

> Contra Augustinum narratur serpere quidam
> *Scriptor*, quem dudum livor adussit edax:
> Qui caput obscuris contectum utcunque cavernis
> Tollere humo miserum perpulit anguiculum.
> Aut hunc fruge sua *aequorei pavere Britanni*,
> Aut huic campano gramine corda tument.

The Benedictine editors are doubtful as to who the person meant is, as they show by the title they use, viz. 'Epigramma in eundem *aut alium quempiam* Augustini obtrectatorem,' Migne, tome 51, coll. 150.

[2] They are regarded by Dom Morin as written by Fastidius, who will claim our attention in the next chapter.

Martin. The main part of this biography consists of an account of two visits made by Germanus to Britain with the view of putting an end to Pelagianism. The *Chronicle* of Prosper—on Pelagianism not so dry as chronicles generally are—his *Contra Collatorem*, and the Life just mentioned, form, practically, our only sources of information respecting this mission, a mission which, whether directly successful or not at the time, made Germanus or Garmon, as he was called, a great and outstanding personage in Britain.

Lupus of Troyes came to Britain with him. What we know of this visit from Prosper is the evidence of a contemporary very deeply interested in the controversy, so that it is very difficult to admit any possibility of error either in fact or in date. The *Vita Germani*, the alternative source of information, was written about A. D. 480, that is, about fifty years after the events narrated. The most available text of the Life is that printed in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Julii vii, pp. 201–21, from which the extracts in Haddan and Stubbs's *Councils*, vol. i, are taken. This *Vita*, however, is now proved, by fuller examination of MSS., to be interpolated, but the earliest printed edition, published by Mombritius at Milan in 1480, gives, it is agreed, an approximate reproduction of the genuine work. The fullest information respecting the book, the author, and his times, is a contribution in the *Neues Archiv*, vol. xxix (1903), by Wilhelm Levison. It is written in preparation for a new edition of the *Vita Germani* which will appear in the series of *Scriptores Rerum Merovingicarum*.[1]

The date, as was said, of this work of Constantius is about A. D. 480. The author belonged to that set of literary men in Gaul, poets and wits, who have become familiar to the world through the Letters and Poems of Sidonius Apollinaris.

[1] The *Vita* appears on foll. 319–25 of the fine British Museum copy of Mombritius: the Bollandists give a full account of classified MSS. and editions in *Hagiographica Latina*, iii. A reprint of Mombritius's very rare work has just been edited by the Benedictines of Solesmes, 2 vols., Paris, 1910. The *Analecta Bollandiana*, xxiii, contains a criticism of Levison's examination of the materials.

It would be well to remember that the name Gaul was, in the latter half of the fifth century, applied to the whole of that country extending from the south coast to the river Rhine, and the correspondents of Sidonius are found at Marseilles, Arles, Lyon, Auxerre, Rheims, and Trier.[1] Constantius was one of these; Sidonius dedicates his Letters to him.

Opinions were then, even among friends, much divided in Gaul on theological points, one of these points being an acute form of that semi-Pelagianism which began with John Cassian's *Collationes* and infected many genuine admirers and disciples of Augustine. Constantius's main object in writing a Life of Germanus, who had been dead thirty years, and had begun his active life more than fifty years previously, was, no doubt, the spiritual edification of readers, and the glorification of a remarkable saint to whose career a cycle of miracle stories was attached: but it seems to me that Constantius by his description of the divine manifestations in Britain against Pelagianism intended also to influence his own people at home. The lengthy character of the narrative of the visits and the minuteness of descriptive detail in the parts dealing with Britain lead us to, or at least suggest, some hypothesis of this kind.

Any endeavour to remove, or even lessen, the supernatural element in a book such as this would be a historical blunder. The author belongs to his age; saints and relics are to him naturally accompanied with many and frequent miracles, and, without committing an anachronism, we are more likely to find the truth we are in search of if we approach his work

[1] For a charming account of Sidonius Apollinaris (430–89), and the literary men of his time, alike in their many weaknesses and in their better qualities, see Dr. Hodgkin's *Italy and her Invaders*, vol. iii, pp. 297 ff. 'One man alone . . . gives us the more detailed information concerning the thoughts, characters, persons of the actors in the great drama (i.e. the settling of the Teuton in the lands of the Latins) which can make the dry bones of the chronologers live. This is Caius Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius, man of letters, imperial functionary, country gentleman, and bishop' (p. 303). Dr. Bigg, in Lecture III of his *Wayside Sketches in Ecclesiastical History*, also deals with this man of letters, who became Bishop of Clermont in A.D. 467. The best edition of his Letters and Poems is by Bruno Krusch in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, vol. viii.

with some amount of sympathy. To whittle away all the miraculous would certainly leave us the poorer; to rationalize excessively, and by doing so find a deep recondite meaning, frequently turns out to be a grave mistake. This miraculous element in Christian literature appears early as a component part even of contemporary and genuinely historical narratives, as any one can see in the writings of such men as Ambrose, Sulpicius Severus, Paulinus of Nola, Augustine, and Palladius in his *Historia Lausiaca*.

Germanus became Bishop of Auxerre (Autissiodorum) about A.D. 418, and died about 450. The exact date is dependent on the various inferences deducible from the mention of him in the Life of St. Geneveve (*Vita Genovefae Virginis*[1]) and a few other details. The two letters prefixed to the *Vita* are considered genuine by Levison, though neither is found in Mombritius.[2] Patiens, to whom the first letter is addressed, became Bishop of Lyon in 449, and is known to have been present at a Synod of Arles along with Faustus of Riez shortly before 475; he may have died about 494. Censurius was Bishop of Auxerre when he received the second letter along with the *Vita* from Constantius, then a presbyter, probably, at Lyon.

At that time, it is important to remember, there was intellectual activity in Gaul, though the barbarians were sweeping over large tracts of the country. 'Authors were still writing, amanuenses transcribing, friends complimenting or criticizing, and all the cares and pleasures of literature filling the minds of large classes of men, as though no empires were sinking and no strange nationalities were suddenly rising around them.' Amid this busy literary activity a more serious type appears in such a work as the Life of Germanus, written by the intimate friend of Sidonius Apollinaris. Constantius's work appeared nearly fifty years, as has been said, after the first visit to Britain, and thirty after the death of Germanus. The life of the great bishop is said by him to be 'overshadowed by silence': 'so many

[1] Krusch, *Passiones Vitaeque Sanctorum Script. Rerum Merov.*, p. 219.

[2] 'Constantius ad Patientem episcopum de Vita sancti Germani episcopi Autisiodorensis.'

years have passed,' the Preface says, 'that knowledge, because of the obscurity of silence, is with difficulty secured.' Such an avowal prepares us for what is to come.

It is impossible not to accept the clean-cut definite evidence of Prosper. I find in his writings no attempt or tendency to magnify the Bishops of Rome beyond what may be found in many other writers of the time, who generally regarded the concurrence or approbation of the Western *apostolica sedes* as a matter of highest consequence. An instance of this appears even in the studied deference of the letter to Innocent, sent from Africa, where Augustine was leader, after the two Councils of Mileva and Carthage in 417. The same deferential tone and desire to secure the support of Rome are evident in the correspondence between Nestorius of Constantinople or Cyril of Alexandria and Caelestine. But, although the motives for minimizing or discrediting such statements as those of Prosper were once strong, historians of to-day, led by a better sense of the importance of objective evidence, recognize therein an ascertained truth. They recognize that in the fifth century no bishop in any quarter of the empire held the pre-eminent position then accorded to the Bishop of Rome. This pre-eminent influence possessed by him, backed as it was by universal reverence, was a real power and of the very first importance. And while care must be taken that ideas of the twelfth century, helped out by a series of forgeries and interpolations, are not imported into the fifth, there is need of equal care in observing and stating fully the real feeling of the earlier time. There may have been no 'obedience' acknowledged in Britain towards the Bishop of Rome—it seems quite impossible there could have been—yet his messenger would be unhesitatingly acknowledged and respected.

Summing up the information which may be gathered from Prosper we arrive at the following facts: in the first place a certain Agricola was propagating in Britain doctrines of a Pelagian character; secondly, at the recommendation of a deacon named Palladius, Caelestine in the year 429

selected Germanus, a Gallic bishop, to proceed to Britain for the purpose of counteracting this teaching. No mention is made by this author of a second visit about 447, an omission which is not unnatural, as by that time Prosper had been settled for years at Rome, and affairs of Gaul find by then but scant place in his *Chronicle*. Still he leaves unnoticed an embassy from the Churches of Britain, and a Gallic Council commissioning Germanus to proceed to Britain. Our judgement respecting the importance of these points will depend upon our estimate of the narrative in the Life of Germanus. When the reader takes up the *Vita Germani* of Constantius he feels, at once, that he is in another world as compared with the stiff, formal *Chronicle* of Prosper. Constantius's work has the character and air of a romance. About threescore years and ten previously men had been made acquainted with new marvels in the Life of St. Martin of Tours. It was time a similar account should be prepared of Germanus, who stood almost as high as the other, second, at least, only to him, and by one who was possessed of the same literary gift as the author of the *Vita Martini*. Patiens, the Bishop of Lyon, found such a writer in Constantius.

It was Constantius, we may almost say, who created Germanus for coming generations. The style is of the period; a touch of poetry runs all through; short, crisp sentences, with life and movement in them, present incidents in a setting which must have been largely the creation of the author's own genius. Phrases, and even events, from older Lives are utilized afresh, yet without any consciousness of deception. Such lore and such use of the legendary and miraculous as quickly became the common property of every writer of a saint's Life, appear in the work from which we are endeavouring to find what may be further known of Germanus and the struggle for orthodoxy in Britain. He is, of course, a worker of miracles. No idea of him, at the end of the fifth century, would have been considered appropriate or worthy without this constant attestation of wonders. Yet it would hardly be correct to say that 'the main motive of the Life—its main interest for

its author—was to represent Germanus as a miracle-worker'.[1]

Miracle-working must accompany the accomplishment of the more important work of the saint. A miracle-worker indeed Germanus was; to his prayer nothing was impossible: he raised the dead and healed the sick; evil spirits hovered about his person, yet were never able to harm him or his work. On the sea, a hostile legion of demons brought over sky and day a night of clouds; there was a mist of darkness, of sea and air; the sails could not stand the blasts of wind, while Germanus tranquilly slept; but he was roused by Lupus, and brought about a great calm. The spirits, after their discomfiture, angrily proclaimed his coming.

But the *Vita* had besides a higher aim than the representation of him in the character of a miracle-worker. An embassy from Britain—such is the account—arrived in Gaul, bringing the information that the error of Pelagianism had affected many in Britain, and that the Catholic faith required speedy help. On this account a numerous Synod or Council was held. Every one besought Germanus and Lupus, the two most illustrious luminaries of religion, as all judged, to undertake the task, for 'they were apostolic priests whose bodies belong to earth, but hold heaven by their merits'.[2] They accepted the task; they filled Britain, the first, the greatest of the islands, with their teaching, preaching, and virtues. Daily pressed by a vast crowd, the divine word was spread by them, not only in the churches, but also along the highways, the rural parts, and the byways; everywhere catholics were strengthened, the wayward ones came to know correction. In these priests were found apostolic glory, and authority over conscience; there was doctrine in their learning, power in their merits, and it was the divine truth they declared with such authority. The whole region quickly passed to their way of thinking. . . . An immense multitude, a vast excited crowd, with their wives and children, came together. These people were both

[1] Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 248.

[2] Beda, *H. E.* i. 17–21, follows Constantius in this part, and his narrative was in turn used for interpolation in the later recensions of the story.

spectators and judges. The parties stood before them, unlike however, because their support was different. 'On this side divine authority, on that human audacity; here Christ, there Pelagius is leader. . . .' The people could hardly be restrained, their judgement was given with a great shout.

The foregoing is a free rendering of Constantius's narrative. It is of equal importance for our purpose to observe the *mode* of writing employed by him as to note the facts he chronicles. The picture, with its fulness of colour, is very vivid, but is it historical? We are doubtful as to the true answer. The story as a whole is probably true, though the details of incident may be creations of the author's own mind. We remember his own admission at the beginning that *agnitio* had indeed become *obscurata*, while the standard of feeling peculiar to the time left him free to change details or to create new ones. Yet we remember that Lupus, Germanus's companion and co-bishop, was living at the time of writing, and intimate with Constantius's friend, Sidonius Apollinaris.

The date of the visit is definitely known from Prosper as A.D. 429. Nothing beyond the vague words 'at the same time' (*eodem tempore*) appears in the *Vita*; neither are we informed, in it, of the place of embarkation or of landing; nowhere is the name of any locality that can be identified to be found. The crisp records of Prosper and this *Vita* agree as to the mission itself, its object and success: they differ, or seem to differ, as to the means by which it was brought to pass. Germanus, according to Prosper, was *sent* by the Bishop of Rome as his representative (*vice sua*), and of this we have no right to be in any way doubtful. The *Vita* of Constantius relates how 'an embassy sent from Britain informed the Gallic bishops that the Pelagian frowardness was widely taking possession of the people in their districts, and that the earliest possible succour should be given to the Catholic faith'. Probably we have here a record of what was going on in Britain. By the Edicts of Caelestine and the emperor many Pelagians had been driven into exile, of whom some were Britons and, at the time to which Constantius refers, may have been actively

propagating the tenets in which they opposed the followers of the Augustinian tradition. The more intellectual Pelagians strove, and strove successfully, against men who simply relied on tradition. This was, possibly, the state of Britain described in the *Vita*.

The story of the embassy from Britain to Gaul may well accord with our information from Prosper, who simply mentions the appeal which fell within his own sphere of knowledge; there was room and scope for the two. The *Vita* describes the calling of a Gallic Synod where the two bishops, Germanus and Lupus, are *solicited* (*ambiuntur*) to undertake the journey. Now, though this account might be so manipulated as not to clash with Prosper's statement that Germanus was the deputy of the Roman bishop, yet the grandiose style, beginning just at this point, gives reason for hesitation. Constantius was acquainted with synods, which had been common in Gaul within the latter half of the fifth century at such places as Orange, Vaison, and Arles—sixteen may be counted since 451—so that a Council of bishops would appear to him the ordinary way of deciding who was most competent to deal with the grave task in Britain. It would not have been so had he been writing in 429. The very fact that this Council is said to be *numerosa*, while no other record of it has survived, is suspicious; I am unable fully to believe that it was ever held; it seems to be the creation of Constantius.

We may imagine—we have no means of knowing—how the Britons succeeded in making known their anxieties to Germanus; when informed, he was not the man to linger. The companion of Germanus was Lupus, Bishop of Troyes (*episcopus Trecensis*), in the province of Sens. Four letters to him are extant among those of Sidonius Apollinaris. Of these the last helps to fix his age: in 479 he had been bishop for fifty years. Thus when he sailed with Germanus his appointment at Troyes must have been a very recent one. The *Vita Lupi*, written shortly after his death, also speaks of the mission to Britain, adding one special detail, that the passage was made in winter,[1] but at the same time

[1] One is tempted to smile in reading, 'Terribilis oceani fluctus, tem-

recounting in all seriousness the same kind of miracles as are found in the somewhat earlier *Vita Germani.*

There are certain ideas about Lupus from which, though they are of no great importance, we ought to free ourselves. They were once indigenous to Wales, and thence passed into England. Sometimes we find Lupus's name made into *Bleiddian* in Welsh documents. It has also been alleged that churches are to be found in South Wales 'dedicated' to Lupus under the supposed form of his name Blethian or Bleiddian.[1] Such a supposition is most unlikely. The Welsh *Brut* of Geoffrey of Monmouth has simply, 'Garmon escob a Lupus Tranotius.' The Latin form is 'Germanus Altisiodorensis episcopus et Lupus Trecensis episcopus'.[2] Moreover, Llan-bleiddian, or Llanyblethian, by a well-known rule, requires a name Pleiddian, not Bleiddian, just as Llanbedr presupposes not Bedr, but Pedr. Further on it will be shown that the idea of dedication of a place or church is foreign to early British usage. Llan-illtud or Llan-dudno, e.g., does not mean a church dedicated to either of these saints, but the *llan* of Illtud or of Tudno himself.

The vindication of Catholic truth, described in the previous extract, is made more conclusive by a miracle. A kind of prince described as *vir tribuniciae potestatis* brings his blind daughter upon the scene. Through the instrumentality of the relics of the saints her sight is restored by Germanus. The minds of all are cleared of impious thoughts, so that the teaching of the priests is listened to with enthusiasm.

When 'the damnable unbelief' is suppressed, its upholders confuted, and the minds of all men have been settled by the purity of faith, the priests betake themselves to the grave of St. Alban to present through him their

poribus hibernis inexplorato mari se committentes, orationis gubernaculo mitigabant,' Krusch, *M. G. Scriptores Rerum Merov.* iii, *Vita S. Lupi*, pp. 120–4. Cf. *Aa. Ss.* Julii vii, 81–2. The letters to Lupus from Sidonius Apollinaris are Liber vi, *Epp.* i. 4, 9, and Liber ix, *Ep.* xi.

[1] Iolo MSS. 42, 43, but frequent in more modern writers, e.g. Rees, *Welsh Saints*, p. 131.

[2] *Brut*, p. 136 (Evans's edition); *Historia Regum Brit.* vi. 13.

thanksgiving unto God. Germanus brings with him relics of all the Apostles and of other saints, and, after prayer, commands the tomb to be opened in order that the precious relics may be placed therein. This is done, and an innumerable crowd of men are converted to the Lord on that same day. More remarkable miracles follow.

Such in substance is the story, as told by Constantius. It reveals to us, beyond the miraculous powers attending a great personage, the kind of ideas with respect to the adoration due to relics of the saints and their efficacy which then prevailed in Gaul, as also in Britain. But with the same indefiniteness that characterizes the rest of the work, the story fails to state the place of St. Alban's burial. Gildas certainly does not assert that the place of martyrdom was at Verulamium (St. Albans), while the *Passio*, quoted by him and afterwards by Beda, seems to suggest that the saint suffered somewhere in the neighbourhood of the river Thames.[1] The story proceeds to tell how the Picts and Saxons joined their forces for battle against the Britons, but definite information as to the place is again wanting. In the British camp, Christ fights, it is related, by means of the apostolic leaders; it is the holy time of Lent (*quadragesimae venerabiles dies*), the more hallowed by reason of the priests' presence, who, by daily preaching, led the people, 'vying with one another' (*certatim*), to seek baptism. On Easter Sunday the vast multitude crowd the church, and, wet with the water of baptism, the army marches in confident faith that heaven will lend its aid. They are not disappointed; Germanus directs the movements of the British host, leading it to a valley surrounded by hills and commanding all to answer his voice with one shout. Approaching the enemy, the priests thrice shout *Halleluiah*, which is answered by their army in one great shout echoed aloud among the hills. At once the affrighted enemy flees, the battle is won without bloodshed, victory is gained by faith, not by force of arms.

One could wish it were possible to believe some of this: it would be something even to know that a reminiscence

[1] Gildas, c. 11; Beda, *H. E.* i. 7.

of the battle is found in the Welsh name Maes Garmon (Garmon's field). This field, or Maes, lies near Mold, in Flintshire; the adjacent parish bears the same name Llanarmon (= Llan of Garmon).[1] But when the long conference and frequent preachings after landing in winter are taken into account, as well as the time spent in visiting the grave of St. Alban, it is barely possible that this part of North Wales could have been reached by Easter. Besides, few names, as has been already said, are more common than Germanus (Garmon). Some bearer of this name at a later time founded a *llan* (*lanna*), or small monastery, in this place which took the name Llanarmon, to which also the field or *podium*, as the Welsh *Vitae* term such a portion, probably belonged. The Halleluiah victory, so called, is nowhere else recorded; but, whatever interpretation be given of the legendary colouring of the narrative, there can be no objection to it on the score of the improbability of the combination in 429 of Saxons and Picts. The Saxons are known to be old enemies by the title 'Count of the Saxon shore' (*Comes litoris Saxonici*) found in the *Notitia Dignitatum* (p. 80) among military officers. The *Chronica Gallica* of 452 mentions Britain as *Britanniae Saxonum incursione devastatae*, and for the year 442 as *usque ad hoc tempus variis cladibus eventibusque latae in dicionem Saxonum rediguntur*. More marked are the words of Ammianus Marcellinus (xxvi. 4) that the Saxons had in 364 combined with the Picts and Scots to ravage Britain. The victory itself may well be a historical fact. It must be located, however, not in Wales, but somewhere near the east or south-east coast.

To proceed with the narrative. The two bishops return to Gaul with their mission fully completed. Heaven (by the miracles attending it), the honoured saint of Britain (by the fresh courage inspired at his tomb), evil demons even (though vanquished), had given convincing testimony to the doctrine preached by Germanus and Lupus.

But after a somewhat lengthened period news was brought to Gaul that the old error was again spreading

[1] Bright, *Early English Church History*, pp. 19, 20, following Rees.

in Britain, though its abettors (*authores*) were not numerous. A second time, after a lapse of twenty years, Garmon crosses the sea for a fresh conflict, to be attended once more by similar miracles and to be crowned again with success.

There can hardly be any doubt that this second visit is historical. When the news came of a recrudescence of the Pelagian error, the prayers of all were directed to Germanus that he would again champion the cause of God (*causam Dei*). To these petitions he at once gave assent, 'delighting in labours, spending himself freely for Christ.' With him this time Severus was joined, the newly ordained Bishop of Trier, just as Lupus, the companion of 429, was the lately ordained Bishop of Troyes, both young men. When they put to sea the very elements combined to make the passage a quiet one; wind and tide were alike in their favour. Even the evil spirits flew throughout the whole island, though against their will, making known the coming of Germanus. To such good purpose did they do this that Elaphius, a leading chieftain (*regionis illius primus*), hastened to meet the saints, though no earthly messenger had announced their arrival; the whole province followed him. Elaphius had a young son who was wasting away owing to the suffering caused by a contracted knee. A miracle was wrought through Germanus, the bent knee being made straight and perfect health restored. The people were filled with wonder, while the Catholic faith was strengthened in all souls. Conversions on a large scale now commenced; the authors of the sinful heresy were exiled, and the work was so well done that the faith in those parts endured unshaken to the compiler's day. This, in brief, is the story of Constantius.

By Prosper no second visit is recorded, but, as Levison points out, his *Chronicle* is almost entirely void of references to Gallic affairs after 440, owing to his absence from the country. Nor is the date of this visit easy to fix, the only internal evidence of it being the very indefinite statement '*interea* ex Britaniis nuntiatur' ('*meantime* the news is brought from Britain'). The event previously narrated is Germanus's return from Arles, whither he had

gone to plead the cause of his fellow citizens against excessive taxation. His return is placed in 441; his death, as certain marked references to him in the Life of St. Geneveve[1] are explained, may be put about 450 or 451, and, therefore, between these dates (441–50) the second visit to Britain. The year generally given is 447.

We shall refer below to an interesting visit made by a British bishop to Faustus, Bishop of Riez, and to Sidonius Apollinaris, about 475, to whom he showed books which he was carrying back with him from Gaul to Britain. It is also noteworthy how Constantius, in his biography of a Gallic bishop, lays the chief stress on that bishop's two visits to Britain and the successful overthrow of Pelagianism there. Thus it may be gathered that, at a time when Goths, Franks, and Burgundians were taking possession of Gaul, and the Saxons were spreading their power in Britain, a strong link of unity between the two countries was preserved by means of the Church, notwithstanding grave differences as to doctrine. Constantius seems to have had some knowledge, more or less intimate, of Britain when he wrote: 'The faith in those parts even to this day endures undefiled.'

Although the coming of Germanus left a deep impression in Britain itself, it is somewhat strange that Gildas, though he possessed Jerome's *Commentary on Jeremiah* and the doughty Dialogues against the Pelagians, yet nowhere mentions either Pelagius or Germanus.[2] His was a weightier task, he must have felt, than what might be expected from a historian's mere interest in events as such.

The Bishop of Auxerre appears in later writers as the founder of monasteries, as the enemy of the Saxons, as the

[1] *Vita Genovefae, Aa. Ss.* Jan. i, 138-43, and Krusch, p. 219. The death of Germanus is placed by the Bollandists in 448. See also Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i, p. 19.

[2] Cf. the author's edition of Gildas, edited for the Cymmrodorion Society, notes on pp. 4, 18, 112; also on pp. 99, 144, 214 (cc. 38, 62, 92). He did not know at the time of writing that the quotation, probably in all three places, but certainly in c. 62 ('ut quidam ante nos ait', &c.), is from Jerome.

stout opponent of the traitor prince Vortigern, also as the teacher of Illtud (*Ildutus*) or of Paulinus (*Vita David*), and therefore as closely connected with Saint David, Samson, Gildas, and Paul Aurelian. He was the teacher also of Briocus and St. Patrick, if we may trust the biographer of the former.

The *Historia Brittonum* of Nennius introduces Germanus with the express object of relating the miracles performed by him in Britain (*aliquanta miracula quae per illum Dominus fecit, scribenda decrevi*).[1] But the visit is put at an impossible date (347 *post passionem Christi*), i.e. about A.D. 380 and during the reign of Gratian. This is the date at which he places the coming of the Saxons to Thanet by the invitation of Guortigernus (Vortigern), adding that 'in his time came sanctus Germanus'. Germanus is said to have come to Britain *to preach* (*ad praedicandum*); the heathenism around him was thick.[2] Nothing is said of opposing Pelagianism. It is difficult to believe that Nennius had read, or at least used, the *Vita Germani*, though he might be acquainted with the *Miracula*, as recounted in the poetic narrative of Heiricus.[3]

Germanus is represented as preaching in Britain after the Saxons had settled there. His miracles performed in the interest of the campaign against heathenism are marvellous in the extreme, though the same type is repeated afterwards in the Lives of the Saints whom Maelgwn of North Wales harassed. For instance, a calf had been killed, cooked, and placed before Germanus and his companions during their visit to the cruel heathen king named Benli by one who had taken pity upon them; on the morrow, the calf was found with its mother, whole, alive and uninjured! (c. 32). Other wonders follow, and the hospitable owner of the cow and calf 'believed and was baptized with his sons and all of that country'. His name was Catel or Catell Durnluc.

[1] Mommsen's edition, *Chronica Minora*, vol. iii, c. 32, p. 172.

[2] Ibid., it is said: 'multi per eum salvi facti sunt et plurimi perierunt.'

[3] This or a similar work may have been the one mentioned in c. 47: 'Hic est finis Guorthigirni ut in Libro beati Germani repperi.'

Germanus, we read, helped the Britons also in their struggles against the Saxons, and even more, against the tortuous treachery and imbecility of their king Guorthigirn, or, as the name is also found, Vortigirn, in Welsh Gwrtheyrn. Germanus, according to Nennius, was contemporary with the four sons of Gwrtheyrn, and with Ambrosius, who is also called Emrys Guletic (Gwledig). These four were the valiant Guorthemir or Vortimer, who fought the Saxons through four battles—in one of which, as Henry of Huntingdon relates, Horsa was killed, Hengist, 'he who had never fled, fled defeated'—Categirn and Pascent, and, fourth, Faustus, who, though born as a child of sin, was adopted, baptized, and brought up by Germanus.[1]

Nennius's account may be regarded as, in substance, an echo of a tradition in which the Britons long regarded Germanus as a great benefactor, both spiritually and politically.

Germanus appears, not infrequently, in the Lives of British Saints. Briocus, also called Briomaglus, from *Coriticiana regio* (to be identified probably with Ceredigion), was sent when of age to Germanus in Gaul, where he had as his beloved companions and fellow disciples Patricius and Heltutus, known to us as Patrick and Illtud.[2] These two famous personalities, by this and other allusions, are brought into close connexion with Germanus and Auxerre. Prof. Bury, in his *Life of St. Patrick*, devotes a whole chapter to a discussion of the time spent by the Apostle of Ireland in studious preparation for work in that island, under the guidance of the Bishop of Auxerre (pp. 48 ff.).[3] Illtud was the teacher of St. David, Samson, Gildas, and others celebrated in British-Welsh hagiography, though in

[1] Nennius, c. 48, p. 192.

[2] The MS. has *in civitatem Parisiacam* by a scribe's error for *Altissiodorensem*. *Analecta Bollandiana*, ii. 164.

[3] C. 50 of Nennius's *Historia Britonum* begins Part III in Mommsen's edition of *Vita Patricii*; it speaks of him as 'another legate, who, after hearing of the death of Palladius, is sent by Pope Caelestine, with the direction and suasion of "Sanctus Germanus episcopus", to the Scots (Irish) with the view of converting them to the faith of Christ'. On Prof. Bury's hypothesis, see beginning of ch. xix.

the *Vita*, written by Rychmarch (Ricemarcus, 1096), David is stated to have been a disciple of Paulinus, but Paulinus, like Illtud, had been a disciple of Germanus.

Some documents contain similar statements about St. Samson of Dol. For instance, the *Vita* contained in the *Book of Llandâv* makes him a disciple of Germanus, though other *Vitae* describe him as one of the great four (Dewi, Gildas, Samson, Paul of Leon) who called Illtud master. Yet they all agree in stating that, after Samson had retired to lead a solitary life in the desert, he was searched for and made abbot of a monastery 'said to have been built by Germanus'. The place was near the Severn, and the *Vita* expressly emphasizes the local tradition (*ut aiunt*).[1] It is not unlikely that, during the peregrinations described by the author as made in the footsteps of Samson, he found in those parts a 'Llanarmon', which would mean to him 'Monastery of Garmon'.

Adamnan, who died A.D. 703, the author of the *Life of Columba*, was acquainted with the *Life of Germanus*, and, in comparing the experiences of the two saints during the passage across the channels they had respectively to cross, quotes the paragraph which describes how 'legions of demons' met Germanus on the sea, raising violent storms to oppose his crossing for the salvation of mankind (*causa humanae salutis*).

The writer of the *Book of Llandâv* (p. 68), forgetful of the Arian controversy, which, Gildas asserts, 'vomited its poison' into Britain, says that the faith was kept pure from the time of Lucius until the Pelagian heresy arose. To oppose this heresy, he relates, the holy Bishop Germanus and Lupus were sent by the Bishops of Gaul. Often had supplications from the Britons been sent to them, imploring their aid against so cursed a peril, since they were unable to acquiesce in the evil doctrine of the heretics or to confute them. So far the writer describes the circumstances with

[1] 'Apud Habrinum' (*h* has already taken place of *s*): 'sanctum Samsonem quasi angelum Dei mirifice exceperunt, abbatemque eum in monasterio quod, ut aiunt, a sancto Germano fuerat constructum, constituerunt,' Vita S. Samsonis, *Anal. Boll.* vi, p. 104.

some knowledge of and dependence on the 'Life' written by Constantius. From this point, however, he seems to be at sea. When the aforementioned elders, he goes on, had extirpated heresy, they consecrated bishops in many parts of the island of Britain, but they consecrated Dubricius, who was also elected by the king and the whole see (*parrochia*), as chief teacher and archbishop over all. By giving him this dignity, Germanus and Lupus founded an archiepiscopal throne (*sedem*) for him, with the consent of King Mouricius, the princes, the clergy and people at Lantam (Llandâv). This is a mixture of twelfth-century ideas and early sixth-century facts. Geoffrey of Monmouth and Giraldus Cambrensis, however, make Dubricius Archbishop of Caerlleon (*Urbs Legionum*). How completely valueless and unreliable from the strictly historical point of view such accounts are, beyond the tradition already mentioned, will be seen also from the fact that Dubricius is placed somewhere about 500–40, while Germanus and Lupus are said to have instituted him in 429!

Regarded as a man who had saved the faith when the native Church was hard pressed, as a promoter of monachism and building of monasteries, as a teacher of well-known saints, and as a powerful auxiliary against the Saxons, Germanus took a prominent place in the people's imagination, and he remained long a revered personage of the past.

CHAPTER XV

BRITISH PERSONAGES OF THE FIFTH CENTURY

Fastidius, Faustus, Riocatus, Nynias, Patrick

There is a historical interest in the investigation of what may be known respecting a few men not directly connected with the controversy dealt with in the previous pages. It has been already stated that Pelagius was the first British monk known to us, but one who had been attracted to monachism in the East, just like Jerome and Rufinus. Slowly but yet surely that new movement became a monachism of the West. The homes of regular asceticism were rising in esteem and consequence near Marseilles and on the neighbouring island of Lerins, and it spread as a tide even as far as Britain.

An examination of those fragmentary references to Britain which the literature of the period has handed down affords a few glimpses that will help in estimating her religious condition at the time.

1. Fastidius

It is possible that Fastidius wrote between A.D. 420 and 430, about the time that Agricola carried Pelagianism to Britain. So much may be inferred from the place he occupies in Gennadius's *De Viris illustribus*, where he comes before Cyril of Alexandria but after Celestine and 'Theodore of Ancyra, who wrote against Nestorius'. Gennadius's order is approximately chronological.

In the fifty-seventh chapter of his book Gennadius writes as follows: 'Fastidius, a bishop of the Britons, wrote to a certain Fatalis a book on "The Christian Life" and another on "The Preserving of Widowhood", sane in doctrine and

worthy of God.' In reality, only one book is known, and this was, at first, printed among the works of St. Augustine. It may be that Gennadius regarded cc. 1–14 as the book on 'Christian Life', and cc. 15 ff. as the other on 'Widowhood'. This book, or rather tractate, is printed in Migne, *P. L.* tome 50,[1] and is interesting as illustrating the kind of piety that existed in Britain. To us this is its chief interest, as there might have been many pastors of this type and many widows similar to the Christian lady whom he addresses.

But the tractate has been represented as showing marks of Pelagianism, and, therefore, a strong witness of the wide acceptance of such doctrines in Britain. It may be doubted, however, whether it contains anything consciously tending to Pelagianism; and Caspari, who has made a very exhaustive examination of the subject, can only say that the Pelagianism is 'suggested, leaking out rather than directly and openly expressed'.[2]

The idea that the book is Pelagian is based almost exclusively on three passages in cc. 8, 11, and 13, but when closely examined they are far from justifying such an interpretation. Of these stress is chiefly laid on the words in c. 13, with which are compared words by Pelagius himself which run: 'On this account Adam's sin was held to have injured his posterity by example not by transmission' (*hinc Adae peccatum exemplo posteris asserebatur nocuisse*

[1] The *De Vita Christiana*, Caspari says, is ascribed in two MSS. to Augustine, but in Cod. Casin. 232, saec. xi/xii, it is in both superscription and subscription named as *De vita Xriana Fastidii ep.*: a MS. of St. Gall, 132, ix/x, designates it as *Liber Pelagii heretici de vita Cristiana.* 'Die pseudo-augustinische Schrift *De Vita Christiana* ist, wenn auch nicht sicher, so doch sehr wahrscheinlich identisch mit den beiden von Gennadius dem britischen Bischof Fastidius beigelegten Büchern.'

[2] Caspari, *Briefe, Abhandlungen*, &c., p. 360. Caspari ascribes these, as we have seen, to the British Pelagian Agricola: but he is in this part investigating the possible authorship by Fastidius. Another ancient MS. of Corbey, published by Holstenius, has the reading: *Fastidius Britto scripsit* (remainder the same), and it has been concluded that he was no bishop, e. g. Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i, p. 16, Note B. This, however, can be no valid ground for any such conclusion.

non transitu). But in Fastidius not a syllable is found about Adam's sin *in relation to his posterity*; the whole subject seems quite foreign to his purpose and really *excludes* all reference to the Augustinian doctrine. Fastidius means to describe not only the *character* of Adam's sin but that of every other man as well; it was, he says, 'a sin of disobedience, not of unbelief. Adam was condemned (*damnatus est*) because he disobeyed in act, and for the same reason are all men condemned.' He insists, with a practical intent, on the necessity of obedience, as well as of faith, for a good life. With this purpose he contrasts not example and transmission, but want of faith and lack of obedience as grounds of condemnation on the part of God. There is here no Pelagianism.

The widow to whom he writes is advised by Fastidius to be a 'holy widow, humble and quiet, to do, without ceasing, deeds of mercy and righteousness, so that, if possible, no one may find her occupied with anything but reading or prayer'. He asks whether she would consider him a Christian in whom are not found the deeds of a Christian life (c. 11). If such a one come to the church for worship will his prayer be heard in heaven? Then Isaiah's words, 'Wash ye, make ye clean . . .' are quoted: hereupon follow the words of the prayer that is singled out and commented upon from the writings of Pelagius,[1] by Jerome. But Fastidius simply adds it to illustrate the (quoted) words of the Apostle: 'I will, therefore, that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and doubting.' This prayer of Pelagius—if it was his—could have been used by any pious Catholic without suspicion of heresy.

We observe how Pelagius's Commentary had circulated, with but little suspicion, under the distinguished names of Gelasius and Jerome, and also that his Creed, a weighty document, under the title of *Fides ecclesiae catholicae*, was

[1] *Dialog. c. Pelagianos*, iii. 14; Migne, tome ii of Jerome's *Opera*, p. 611. It is also quoted by Augustine as furnishing ground of objection to Pelagius at Diospolis, *De Gestis Pel.* 6. The Christian is said by Fastidius to use this prayer, *suae innocentiae fidus*.

accepted as an orthodox statement and even attributed by some to Jerome, by others to Augustine himself.

The interest of this little book is enhanced when we remember that it was written and, probably, read in ancient Britain, and may be also a picture of the life led there by many. It reminds us of the more practical chapters in the *Imitatio* of à Kempis. 'Men sin egregiously,' it says, 'when they believe that God is the avenger not of sins but of heresy'; 'unless a man is just, he hath no life'; 'unless a man keeps the commandment of Christ, he hath no part with Him'; 'no one is to be judged a Christian except the man who, in following the teaching of Christ, imitates His example.' 'A Christian is he who extends pity to all, who in no case is ruffled by injury, who suffers not a poor man to be oppressed if he be present . . . who has made himself poor to the world, that he may become rich unto God' (c. 14). How modern it all sounds!

This was the idea of the Christian man entertained in Britain about A. D. 420. But a great change was at hand. Such a book as this could not have been written half a century later. Its simple, chaste Latin was soon lost. Men of the type of Fastidius, and women, of whom his widow correspondent was a noble example, were drawn to seek their ideal of the 'perfect' life in the rigour, the discipline, and the obedience of a monastery.

In the *Praefatio* Fastidius calls himself 'the sinner' (*peccator*): 'That I a sinner and the worst,' he says, 'less wise than others, less able than all, should venture to admonish thee, by a full-worded letter, to walk in the way of holiness and righteousness, is due not to any confidence in my own righteousness, not to skill of wisdom, not to superior knowledge, but solely because of the love towards thee which, according to God, I have cherished in soul and mind.'[1] Of the lady to whom the book is addressed

[1] 'Ut ego peccator et ultimus, insipientior caeteris et imperitior universis, te, ut sanctitatis et iustitiae vitam pergas, crebrioribus audeam litteris admonere, non me propriae iustitiae fiducia, non sapientiae peritia, non scientiae gloria, sed sola quam secundum Deum animo ac mente concepi, charitatis tuae causa compellit.'

the expression *dilectissima soror* is used in the same preface.

Similar words of self-depreciation were common in the fifth century, and *peccator* is especially frequent in the epistles of bishops, yet it is not often that we find so solid a tractate with a preface of this kind.

2. Faustus

The collected letters of Sidonius Apollinaris, previously mentioned, contain two addressed to Faustus, while his name meets the eye in other letters.[1] The Introduction in Krusch's edition gives an exhaustive examination of the life and writings of Faustus. A similar treatment will be found in Engelbrecht's Introduction to Faustus's works.

Faustus became a monk early in life: it is known that he was with Maximus when the latter was Abbot of Lerins (426–33), and, upon the appointment of Maximus in 433 to be Bishop of Riez (Regium or Reii) in the province of Aix, Faustus succeeded him as Abbot of Lerins. He again succeeded him as Bishop of Riez; the date is uncertain, but it must have been before 462, as he took part in a Council at Rome on November 19 of that year. If Faustus was born some time between 405 and 410, as is probable, he would have been quite a child at the time of the Pelagian controversy, and a member of the community at Lerins when Germanus sailed for Britain. Faustus was by birth a Briton. Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, a contemporary and acquaintance, speaks of him as 'by birth a Briton, by abode a man of Riez'. It is true that by other writers, such as Possessor an African bishop, he is styled *Gallus*, but he had lived long enough in Gaul to make that epithet appropriate. In all probability he had been taken over from Britain to South Gaul by his mother, who also was well

[1] 'Gaii Solii Apollinaris Sidonii Epistulae et Carmina, *Fausti Aliorumque Epistulae* ad Ruricium aliosque, Ruricii Epistulae.' Edited by Chr. Lvetjohann and Bruno Krusch, *Mon. Germ. Historica*, vol. viii. Cf. also vol. xxi of *Corpus S. E. Lat.* and *Prolegomena*, by Engelbrecht.

known to Sidonius.[1] They had been drawn thither by the growing reputation of the communities at Marseilles and Lerins for discipline and saintliness of life. The mother is spoken of by Sidonius as 'holy', and as one that inspired reverence; for him, to be introduced to her was as if Israel had introduced him to Rebecca or Samuel to his mother Hannah, just the kind of woman that would have taken a studious son oversea to learn the new discipline, a lady whose piety may be compared with that of the widow to whom Fastidius wrote.

Faustus was like his mother in this respect. In Letter 3 of Book IX Sidonius writes to him thus: 'To Dominus Faustus Papa .... well skilled in prayers .... which you have also carried into the church of which you have charge, in nothing changed from an abbot by becoming priest, since, with the acquisition of the new dignity, you have not relaxed the rigour of the old discipline.'

And in Letter 9 of the same Book he addresses him as one 'to whom it is given to speak better than you teach, and to live better than you speak'. Here probably is a quiet thrust at the too vigorous and combative semi-Pelagianism of Faustus. But let us further mark: Sidonius in the same letter mentions a visit paid to him in Auvergne by a certain Riocatus who had come from Faustus on his way back to Britain, and was detained at Auvergne owing to the disturbed state of the country. This enforced delay gave Sidonius time to read the works of Faustus which Riocatus, himself bishop and monk, was then carrying back

[1] Sidon. Apoll. *Carmen Eucharisticum*, xvi. 84:

> Omnibus attamen his sat praestat, quod voluisti
> Ut sanctae matris sanctum quoque limen adirem.

Krusch is inclined to understand the second line of the Church as spiritual mother, but when Sidonius proceeds,

> Dirigui, fateor, mihi conscius atque repente
> Tinxit adorantem pauido reuerentia uultum;
> Nec secus intremui, quam si me forte Rebeccae
> Israel aut Samuel crinitus duceret Annae,

he is, certainly, simply speaking the praise of Faustus's own mother.

from Riez '*to your fellow Britons*'.[1] This was the second visit of Riocatus to Faustus.

Early in the fifth century John Cassian founded a monastery near Marseilles that soon became famous, and Honoratus founded a community for the same eremite life on the island which lies near Lero—the Sainte-Marguerite of to-day. He also founded Lerinus, now called St. Honorat. Honoratus was born of a noble family in the north-east of Gaul, and against the wish of his family had made the customary journeys to the East, as Pelagius had done. On his return he succeeded in persuading several to follow him in his abandonment of the world, and settled on this small island near the south coast of Gaul.[2] Before long a number of men, full of eager enthusiasm for the new idea of seeking individual access to God in asceticism and retreat, were found in these monasteries and on the neighbouring islands. Their influence spread over all Gaul. In the *De Laude Eremi* of Eucher we read that there were many of those holy elders on the island, who, he says, 'have brought the fathers of Egypt to us Gauls.'[3] In the Life of Saint David we hear almost the echo of these words: 'he imitated the monks of Egypt and lived a life similar to theirs.' Honoratus, Maximus, Vincentius the author of the *Commonitorium*, Eucherius, and Faustus remained the great ones of Lerins in the estimation of the succeeding generations. Faustus was a rigorous ascetic with a grave philosophical cast of mind in his thoughts on religion. 'Of what use will it be to live in this silent place,' he asks in one of the sermons attributed to him, 'if the strife of passions is allowed within a man? Shall there be tranquillity outside and a tempest within? Was it worth while to abandon the world?'

There is another sphere in which Faustus takes a place

[1] 'Legi volumina tua quae Riocatus antistes ac monachus, atque istius mundi *bis peregrinus, Britannis tuis pro te reportat.* . . . Igitur hic ipse venerabilis apud oppidum nostrum cum moraretur donec gentium concitatarum defremeret,' Book IX, p. 158 in Krusch's edition.

[2] The *Sermo de S. Honorato*, ascribed to Hilary of Arles, contains much of this early history of the monastery.

[3] Migne, tome 50, col. 711: 'O happy island of Lerins, small though thou art, thou hast raised mountains innumerable which scale heaven.'

of some consequence. During the Pelagian controversy proper, which Prosper Tiro says (in 437) had burnt itself out, the deep questions connected with predestination, prevenient grace, and election had not the prominence which they received afterwards. In Pelagius we find the denial of original sin, the assertion of free will (especially by way of insistence that man was able to sin or not to sin), and the denial of the need of baptism for infants as a sacrament of forgiveness and regeneration. Pelagianism, essentially a reaction, was not a reaction that continued long. Another reaction took place which arose at first within the well-known monasteries through such men as John Cassian, the saintly Hilarius of Arles, Vincent of Lerins, and, subsequently, Faustus himself. These writers were called at a later period Semi-Pelagians. Loofs asserts that the name *Semi-Augustinians* might with equal right be given them. Whatever merit there might be in moderating the extreme form of Augustinian teaching, it was due to these men, who, while accepting the views of Augustine on the relation of Adam's sin to his posterity, objected to his views on such subjects as predestination, foreknowledge, and irresistible grace. It was against them that Prosper wrote the *Contra Collatorem* and the bulk of the long poem *De Ingratis*; but the divergence continued up to the Council of Orange, presided over by Caesarius of Arles (529).

Faustus could not have brought his Semi-Pelagianism with him from Britain; he learnt it at Lerins, where he was abbot at the time when Vincent published his *Commonitorium* (434) with its famous test of orthodoxy, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.* Yet it is quite possible, we may even say probable, that the recrudescence of Pelagianism in Britain, which called for the second visit of Germanus, was in reality due to the ideas that had come from South Gaul, or, maybe, from almost any part of Gaul, as well.

It is beyond the purpose of this work to enter upon an account of Faustus as he reveals himself in the *De Gratia*, tinged as it is with a very strong condemnation of Pelagius. It is not unreasonable to connect him with that later spread

in Britain of views which the Britons, somewhat mistakenly, regarded as Pelagian. Prosper in 437, as has been mentioned, tells us that Pelagianism was a dead doctrine, and he expostulates with Cassian for fanning into flame the ashes of an extinct fire.[1]

It seems difficult to believe that Britain could have had any long experience of the older Pelagianism proper in 447. 'News was brought from Britain,' so the *Vita Germani* relates, 'that the Pelagian error was a second time spreading, though its promoters were few.' These 'few' we may, with good reason, regard as Semi-Pelagian representatives of the doctrines championed then by Faustus, and at a far earlier period by others also.

It is known that Columbanus, before he left Ireland with his twelve companions for Gaul, had spent his years of monkhood under Comgall in the monastery of Bangor, where strict rules, learnt from the Briton Gildas, had prevailed from the first. It was there that Columbanus became imbued with this revived monachism which had been taken over from Britain. An expression which connects him with Faustus, and so links him with the past, is found in some short homilies of his addressed to monks bearing the name *Instructiones Columbani*,[2] though they profess to be the work of 'a disciple of Faustus'. How much significance is to be attached to this fact that the names of the Celtic missionary and the British Abbot of Lerins appear together in this superscription it is difficult to tell, but at least it shows that the name of Faustus was well known in Celtic circles.

3. Riocatus

Riocatus is hardly more than a name for us, yet the circumstances and the time in which we find him well deserve our attention. The name may have been of Brythonic origin. One of the lay witnesses to a charter

[1] 'Quid cineres extincti dogmatis refovendo, deficientis fumi nidorem in redivivam flammam conaris colligere,' *Contra Collatorem*, 4.

[2] They are printed in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.* xiii. 4, *Instructiones Columbani.*

purporting to be of the time of Oudoceus and Mouric, King of Morcanhuc, is called *Riacat* (*Book of Llandâv*, 140). Among the Christian Latin inscriptions of Cornwall also the form *Ricati* occurs (Rhys, No. 97). In such names, to which also belongs *Succat* or *Sucat*, the Brythonic name said to be given to St. Patrick by his parents, *-cat* means *battle*, and corresponds to the modern Welsh *câd*. Riocatus is the first ecclesiastic recorded in our history bearing a Celtic name, unless, of course, we include Sucat (Sucatus), i. e. St. Patrick. As has been already observed, Riocatus is represented in the Letters of Sidonius Apollinaris as a Briton who, like Gweslyn the companion of Saint David, or the better known St. Martin of Tours, combined the two characters of bishop and monk. Whether, in closer resemblance to St. Martin, he was also abbot of some monastery, we have no knowledge; all that Sidonius says of him is that he was bishop and monk (*antistes ac monachus*), who had made two pilgrimages from Britain to Gaul, to see Faustus it seems, and then carried certain works of Faustus to Britain.[1] If one of these works was 'On Grace' (*De Gratia*), as Zimmer suggests, the visit was subsequent to 473, the year in which the Council was held at Arles to discuss the case of a certain Lucidus who had put forth very extreme views on predestination.[2] But the works may have been some of his Homilies, and non-controversial in character, as Sidonius makes no comment on their contents. A great mass of literature poured into Britain from these centres of active life during this period. Riocatus met Sidonius on his homeward journey, having started from the more southern Riez, and, we may infer, taking Avitacum, the charming villa of Sidonius in Auvergne, on his way to some northern port. Sidonius's letter informs us that his stay there was prolonged because the barbarian hosts barred his progress. We know that at that time, say between 460 and 473, the Franks in the north, the Burgundians in the south-

[1] Sidon. Apoll. *Epistulae*; Krusch, *Mon. Germ. Hist.* viii. 157.
[2] Engelbrecht, Pref. to *Faustus*, p. xv.

east, and the Visigoths in the south-west, were pressing upon the parts of the country which still remained Roman. By 475 Auvergne was in the hands of Euric the Visigoth, and Sidonius himself in exile. The brief notice of Riocatus in *Ep.* 9 vividly hints at the ardent zeal which constrained men, notwithstanding these dangers, to leave Britain in order to visit the abodes of 'the saints' in Southern Gaul, and to procure fresh supplies of books, copies of Scripture, and other writings.

4. Nynias

The chief authority for the life of Nynias is Beda, who informs us that he was a Briton.[1] Ailred, Abbot of Rievaul, in his *Vita Niniani*, written in the twelfth century, preserves a few details, some found by him in an old book which he describes as 'written in a barbarous fashion', and some doubtful details found in the oral tradition of Galloway. If, in accordance with Ailred's narrative, Nynias was with St. Martin, his date must be before 400.

This British missionary bishop lived at Rome for a time, and the Bishop of Rome carried on a correspondence with the Churches in Britain similar to Leo I in 454. But what is of special importance to note is, first, his reverence for St. Martin of Tours; secondly, his extensive missionary work, ordaining bishops and presbyters, particularly in Northern Pictland, and, indeed, in most parts of the north of Scotland. Ogam and other inscriptions bear clear evidence

[1] *H. E.* iii. 4 'fidem veritatis ... praedicante eis verbum Nynia episcopo reverentissimo et sanctissimo viro de natione Brettonum qui erat Romae regulariter fidem et mysteria veritatis edoctus; cuius sedem episcopatus, sancti Martini episcopi nomine et ecclesia insignem, ubi ipse etiam corpore una cum pluribus sanctis requiescit, iam nunc Anglorum gens obtinet. Qui locus vocatur Ad Candidam Casam, eo quod ibi ecclesiam de lapide, insolito Brettonibus more fecerit.'

Besides this section of Beda, one may consult Ussher, who quotes a Life that is now lost (c. xv), Forbes's *Lives of S. Ninian and S. Kentigern*, and Pinkerton's *Lives of the Scottish Saints*, which give Ailred's *Vita*; especially valuable is an article on 'Nynia in Northern Pictland' in the *Scottish Historical Review*, by the Rev. Archibald Black Scott, M.A. Also Bury's *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 313, Appendix.

of this. In Caithness, in Sutherland, even in Shetland, such memorials are found, and there are three islands each bearing the name of St. Ninian. Candida Casa was probably the centre of this wide activity. Afterwards we perceive a stream of missionary effort running from Ireland, and it was these missionary monks that brought their *Kils* to Scotland. We may connect Nynias with a rough monastic and ecclesiastical system resembling that of St. Martin. It yielded to another imported from Ireland, which had come from Lower Britain, as Nynias himself had.

5. St. Patrick

Until about the year 432 Patrick may be regarded as a man of Britain. Born about 389, he grew into manhood during the quiet which the country enjoyed, when the raids of the Picts and Scots following upon the usurpation of Maximus ceased. About 432 he became bishop missionary of Ireland. The most probable date of his death is A.D. 461.

Our leading sources for the history connected with St. Patrick are the following:—

1. His own writings, the so-called *Confession* and *Epistle to the Christian Subjects of Coroticus*: the best edition is that by Dr. White: *Libri Patricii*. The Latin Writings of St. Patrick, edited with Introduction, Translation and Notes by Newport J. D. White, D.D., 1905 (*Proceedings of Royal Irish Academy*, vol. xxv, sec. c, published also separately). The *Epistle* is often quoted as the *Epistle to Coroticus*, which may not be quite correct, yet has meaning, as will be seen from the words of c. 21, desiring it to be 'read in the presence of all the people, yea, in the presence of Coroticus himself'. Coroticus had made captives of some newly baptized disciples of St. Patrick, and the name, it may be mentioned, has by many been identified with the British Ceredig (Ceretic) and by Dr. Todd with the son, so called, of Cunedda after whom also Ceredigion (=Cardigan) is supposed to be named (see Mommsen's *Nennius*, pp. 156, 205; Rhys's *Celtic Britain*, p. 118). But another view, held by Sir S. Ferguson in *Trans. R. I. Academy*, xxvii. 116, by Skene, and by Zimmer in *Celtic Church*, p. 54, places Coroticus in Strathclyde.

2. The *Dicta Patricii* and *Hymn of Secundinus*, or St. Sechnall, both of which may be of the fifth century. 'It (the Hymn) may therefore take rank with the *Confession* and the *Letter to the Subjects of Coroticus* as a document of the first importance for the Life of St. Patrick' (the Irish *Liber Hymnorum*, vol. ii, p. 95). On the *Dicta*, see Bury's *Life*, pp. 228-33.

3. The following, of considerably later date, are yet thought worthy of most careful consideration as garnering what previous Patrician literature and tradition had preserved, and as supplementing the bare account of the *Confession* and *Epistle*.

(*a*) A Life of Patrick by Muirchu maccu Machtheni, written 'in obedience to the command' of Bishop Aed of Sletty, who is known to have attended a Council called 'Adamnan's Synod', held in A.D. 697, and may have died A.D. 700.

(*b*) Tirechan's Notes on St. Patrick's Life: Tirechan found his materials in a book owned, or written, either by his foster-father or, more probably, by his teacher (*qui nutrivit me*), Ultan, Bishop of Ardbraccan, who died A.D. 657. Some details he had from conversation with Bishop Ultan (*ex ore*), and with many of the older men (*a senioribus multis*).[1]

Patrick in the *Confessio*, which may be regarded as a kind of *Apologia pro Vita sua*, tells his own story. Our object is not to attempt the difficult task of examining the many questions and vast literature that have clustered around the writings of St. Patrick. We seek, rather, to find out the kind of Christian missionary and pastor which Britain, aided by influences outside itself, produced in the fifth century. Patrick's experience under these influences one may regard as that which other British youths went through. This is sufficient reason for considering it.

From the *Confession* and *Epistle* we select passages which convey information, at first hand, of facts and incidents in the life of Patrick within the limits fixed above. It might be mentioned that *Confessio* is not a name employed by the writer himself, and the work might well be termed, as has been said, his *Apologia pro Vita sua*; it is only secondarily a memoir. The translation used here, except in one place, is Dr. White's.

'I, Patrick the sinner, am the most rustic and the least of all the faithful, and contemptible in the eyes of many. My father was Calpornus, a deacon, a son of Potitus, a presbyter (both Britons), who belonged to the village of Bannauem Taberniae. He had a small farm close by, and here I was taken captive.

[1] See Whitley Stokes, *Tripartite Life*, pp. xci and 271–301; also *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. i, pp. 535, 536, 548 ff. Kuno Meyer, *Cáin Adamnáin*. *Trip. Life*, pp. xci and 302–3; also *Anal. Boll.* vol. ii, pp. 35 ff. Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*, pp. 245 ff., 255 ff.

'I was then about sixteen years of age. I knew not the true God, and I was led into captivity in Ireland with many thousands of persons. . . . There the Lord opened my understanding regarding my unbelief . . . and pitied the youth of my ignorance. . . . I have not studied as others have . . . for my speech and word are translated into a tongue not my own (Latin). . . . After I arrived in Ireland, tending flocks was my daily occupation; and constantly I used to pray in the daytime. . . . In one day I would say as many as a hundred prayers, and at night nearly as many.' He then escaped and found a ship. 'And after three days we reached land, and journeyed for twenty-eight days through a desert. . . . On the sixtieth night after, the Lord delivered me out of their hands. And again, after a few years, I was in Britain with my family, who received me as a son. . . . And there I saw in the night visions of a man named Victoricus coming, as it were, from Ireland, with countless letters. And he gave me one of them, and I read the beginning of the letter, which was entitled, "The Voice of the Irish"; and while I was reading aloud the beginning of the letter I thought that at that very moment I heard the voice of them who lived beside the wood of Foclud, which is nigh unto the Western Sea. And they cried, as with one mouth, "We beseech thee, holy youth, to come hither and walk among us." . . . God be thanked that after many years the Lord granted them according to their cry. . . . And I was tempted by not a few of my elders, who came and (urged) my sins against my (intended) laborious episcopate. . . . After the lapse of thirty years they found occasion (against me), and that on account of a word that I had confessed before I was a deacon. . . . I did not proceed to Ireland of my own accord until I was nearly worn out. But that was rather good for me, for in this way I was corrected by the Lord.' After an account of trials in Ireland he proceeds: 'Wherefore then, even if I wished to part with them (the baptized converts), and proceeding to Britain—and glad and ready I was to do so—as to my fatherland and parents, and not that only, but to go as far as Gaul in order to visit the brethren, and to behold the face of the saints of my Lord.

Brief and fragmentary though these extracts are, they arouse in us not simply an interest in the facts of his life, but also a sense of the man's great spirit.

The *Epistle* does not supply much information relating to this period. The following words deserve to be quoted :—

'I, Patrick the sinner, unlearned as everybody knows: I confess that I have been appointed a bishop in Ireland. Most assuredly I deem that I have received from God what I am. . . . I sent a letter with a holy presbyter, whom I taught from his infancy. . . . Did I come to Ireland without God, or according to the flesh? Who compelled me? I was bound in the spirit not to see any of my kinsfolk. Is it from me that springs that godly compassion which I exercise towards that nation who once took me captive and harried the men-servants and maid-servants of my father's house? I was freeborn according to the flesh. I am born of a father who was a decurion, but I sold my noble rank, I blush not to state it, nor am I sorry, for the profit of others.'

If we place the birth of St. Patrick between A.D. 387 and 390, his death must have occurred about A.D. 461. The locality of the village Bannauem Taberniae is uncertain; it is generally located in North Britain, near Dumbarton on the Clyde.[1] His father, he tells us, was a deacon and, strange

[1] Another view is based on the suggested correction of Bannauen Taberniae to *bannave tabeniae*, that is *Bannauenta Britanniae*, which is identified with Daventry in Northamptonshire. Mr. E. B. Nicholson, *Academy*, May 11, 1895. This explanation is difficult to accept.

Sir John Rhys has made a most interesting suggestion (Bury's *St. Patrick*, p. x) as to the birthplace of St. Patrick. There are three places in Glamorgan bearing the name Banwen; if this can be identified with *Bannauenta*, it may lead to inferences which would fix the birthplace of Patrick in that part of Wales. Glamorgan would be a not unlikely place for the Irish raids, described by Gildas as beginning after Maximus had carried the Roman troops to Gaul (383–8), which would also recur after the further denudation by the second usurper Constantine, 407–11. The Life of the British saint Briocus relates that when he arrived at the city of Germanus, he found Patrick and the British (Welsh) Hildutus, or Illtud, there already: they, on this hypothesis, would be neighbours. We recall to mind also how the *Life of David* places St. Patrick in South Wales before the angel urged him to depart for Ireland.

to say, a *decurio* also, that is, a member of the *curia*, or what might be called the Council of men of wealth and position, who carried out specified civic duties. After Constantine's exemption of the clergy from these curial obligations many modifications were introduced which resulted, finally, in the repeal of all.[1] Rich people sought by ordination to rid themselves of the hateful curial obligations. Nevertheless, certain regulations, introduced from time to time, tended to check such ordinations. Yet to be a *curialis*, as now to be a high sheriff, remained a position of recognized honour. St. Patrick's father must have been not only a man of substance, but also of more than ordinary capacity, for his services to be requisitioned, or voluntarily given, in civil affairs as well as spiritual. Patrick was carried away in his sixteenth year, but the hardships of his bondage awakened a new self in him. When he escaped from Ireland he seems to have been taken oversea to Gaul. Owing to the devastations of the barbarians at that time Gaul, at least in respect of large tracts of country, might well be termed a desert. A second escape in that country enabled him, apparently, to secure even more than safety; he made his way or was directed to a place of spiritual shelter. The vagueness of the *Confessio*, which was not intended to be a mere memoir, is supplemented here by a statement found in Tirechan's Collections: 'Patrick,' he says, 'remained in the island of Lerins' (*Lerinus*). It is true that the name he gives is *Aralanensis*, but this is now acknowledged to be an error for *insula Lerinensis*.[2]

Thus St. Patrick also went to Lerins, as so many others from very distant places, among them Faustus, from Britain. Prof. Bury places the stay at Lerins between 411–12 and

[1] *Codex Theodosianus*, xvi. 2. 1, 2; ibid. xvi. 2. 3, 6.

[2] Tirechan in *Tripartite Life*, p. 302 (Rolls Series): 'erat hautem in una ex insolis quae dicitur Aralanensis.' Notes on Fiacc's Hymn—'In insula quae dicitur Alanensis,' ibid. p. 420. The *Trip. Life*, p. 26, 'Aralanensis vocabatur insula,' though it is with Germanus. The occurrence of *insula* in each of these statements is against *Arelatensis*, as Dr. Stokes conjectures. Dictum I of Patrick mentions islands, *in insolis quae sunt in mari Tyrrheno*.

414–15; but is this not a somewhat early date for the history of Lerins itself? Also I am inclined to omit the negative in the sentence: 'The repose of Lerins was not uninvaded by the sounds of this debate' (the Pelagian), because the debate in which Lerins *did* take part was quite another, a purely Gallican controversy and of a later date. Marseilles and Lerins condemned Pelagius, as Prosper admits in his poem *De Ingratis*, and as the writings of Cassian, Vincent, and Faustus fully prove; the Augustinian doctrine of the Fall in Adam and original sin, as well as the baptism of infants for regeneration, was accepted by Marseilles and Lerins; their differences with Augustine lay elsewhere, and did not come to a head until about the time of Augustine's death. Patrick would not have heard much of Pelagius if he had been at Lerins during 411–15; he would have heard only words of condemnation.

A long stay at Auxerre is an ascertained fact, but it was broken by a visit to Britain. Somehow there was in his native island a reluctance to ordain him (cc. 26, 37, 46); the *seniores* regarded him as too ignorant for the *legatio*, for the *laboriosus episcopatus*, to which he had vowed himself. Nevertheless, he was ordained, and during the examination for that purpose he underwent great trials which, he records, proved a great gain. But by whom Patrick was ordained, and where, the vagueness of the *Confession*, the silence of Muirchu and Tirechan, and the confusion of other records, render it almost impossible to tell.

There is one view of these years in Gaul which is suggested by the later references to Patrick in Irish records, plausible indeed, but, in the judgement of the present writer, impossible of acceptance. They are spoken of as a time of 'preparation for holy orders'. It is true, as Sulpicius Severus says (*V. Martini*, 10. 8; Halm's edition), that soon after the best pastors *were* found among men who had known the ideals and discipline of the Gallic monasteries. It was this fact which transformed the monasteries of later times into schools. Yet the conception of 'preparing for holy orders', i. e. of a training in theology as a *preparation* for becoming a monk or a cleric, is foreign to this age.

St. Patrick does not allude to it, nor do Muirchu and Tirechan. Higher spiritual ideals were becoming prevalent in South Gaul, a country gaining in the opinion of many, a sanctity equal to that of the Holy Land. It was, in fact, second only to Egypt as the home of saints who were realizing their triumph. This, it seems, was the attraction which drew Patrick from Britain to Gaul. Long afterwards, in the midst of heavy trials, he longs 'to go as far as Gaul in order to visit the brethren, and to behold the face of the saints of my Lord'.

St. Patrick was at that time, and indeed remained, an unlettered man. The difference between his Latin and that of Pelagius is immense. Yet one feels that to this Briton, after his acquaintance with the revived religious life in Gaul, may be applied what M. Gaston Boissier says of St. Martin, who, though so unlearned, yet 'reflects our best qualities, and in whom we re-find our race and our blood. France did not as yet exist, nevertheless Martin is a French saint'. 'Cet ancien soldat était fort illettré, ce qui n'empêche pas que toute une littérature soit née à côté de lui et de son inspiration.' 'He was a man,' he adds, 'of little science, but *de grand sens*.' Whatever the reader's critical presuppositions as he peruses the *Confession* and the *Epistle*, yet if he avails himself of the striking additional evidence in the Tripartite Life, he cannot but conclude that under the rude garb of Patrick there lay that greatness of soul (*grand sens*), that power of unconscious patience, unselfishness and holiness, which in time masters all classes of men.

CHAPTER XVI

MONACHISM. BEGINNINGS

Instead of introducing monachism into this history as a fully formed institution, it will be better to give a very brief account of its first appearance in the Christian world and its remarkable growth. Though there were distinct tendencies towards asceticism from the first, and these had found fullest expression in the writings of Origen, yet Christianity existed three hundred years without either anchorite or monk. Another century elapsed before the western countries of Europe had seen their earliest monasteries, and no monastic communities could have begun to appropriate land, or build their *llans* (*lannae*), as they called their rude settlements along the southern coast of Britain, until a further quarter of a century had passed. This period of varied beginnings requires to be sketched, at least in outline.

The appearance of monachism marked an important stage in the historical development of Christianity. New and abiding features were impressed on religious life; men were inspired by new ideas, and these ideas through the monastery took a strikingly visible form. But this stage of its growth had been reached before monachism was introduced into Britain. From about 305, when St. Anthony began his solitary life as a recluse, or five years later, when the coenobite institution of Pachomius struck out at Tabennisi a new way for the same idea, to the rise of similar communities near Marseilles, about 412–15, was a period of development which accounts for the success of the 'Egyptian way' in Britain.

The history of our subject in this formative period may be studied in the following works:—

1. *Vita Antonii.* This Life is now generally accepted as a genuine work of Athanasius, written probably about 357. It was translated into Latin, as his, by Evagrius before 376, that is, when only three years had passed since the death of the great Alexandrian. See Eichhorn, *Athanasii de vita ascetica*, p. 38, and especially the introduction to the English version by Robertson, *Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity.*

2. *Life of Pachomius*, translated from the Coptic by Amelineau; the same, but with many interpolations, may be read in Greek in *Acta Sanctorum*, Maii, vol. iii, p. 22. Amelineau's edition of the Coptic Life, *Monuments pour servir à l'histoire de l'Égypte chrétienne au IVe siècle: Histoire de St. Pachôme et ses communautés*, is printed in *Annales de Musée Guimet.*

3. *Historia Monachorum*; this work was written by Rufinus, apparently, from notes of a tour made in 394–5.

4. *The Life of Paul of Thebes* and *The Life of Hilarion* by Jerome, as well as his Letters on the monastic life written from Bethlehem. Paul is mentioned by other writers, independent of Jerome, so that the story is not altogether the romance it has been represented.

5. The so-called *Peregrinatio Silviae*—now published in English—which, containing a fragmentary record of a Spanish lady's pilgrimage to Palestine about 380, makes also some passing references to the monasteries of the East. The name Silvia was simply a conjecture on the part of Gamurini, the first editor of the fragment; a better suggestion, made by Dom Ferrotin from a remark in an extant letter of a Spanish hermit, named Valerius, gives the name as Echeria, Egeria, or Etheria. The fragment is, therefore, now called the *Peregrinatio Egeriae.*

6. *Postumian.* In *Dialogue* I, 10–22, by Sulpicius Severus, Postumian, one of the speakers, gives an account of his visit to Egypt and its monasteries, a short time after 400. He did not travel as far as Nitria.

7. *Historia Lausiaca.* In this work an account is given by Palladius of personal experiences and observations during eleven years (388–99) spent in Egypt. Palladius travelled over Nitria and Cellia, and had close intercourse with the followers of both Antony and Pachomius; of all he saw and met, places and men, a graphic record is contained in this book which Palladius wrote at the request of Lausus, chamberlain to Theodosius II. The true text has been restored by the labours of Dom Cuthbert Butler, and is printed, with valuable notes, in *Texts and Studies* (1898, 1904), Cambridge.

8. The *Institutes* (*Instituta*) of John Cassian, a work written some time before 426; his *Collationes*, or Conferences with monks and abbots in Egypt, appeared about 420–30, twenty years after his visit to that country.

In addition to the full Introduction to the *Historia Lausiaca* by Dom Butler, the origin and progress of monachism is discussed with great learning by Bornemann, *In investiganda monachatus origine quibus de causis ratio habenda sit Originis*; Eichhorn, *Athanasii de Vita ascetica*

Testimonia collecta. Later works are: Grützmacher, *Pachomius und das älteste Klosterleben*; Abbé Ladeuze, *Étude sur le Cénobitisme Pakomien*, Preuschen, *Palladius und Rufinus* (mostly on the content and text of the Lausiac History); and *Schenute von Atripe* by Liepold, published in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, a picture, passing strange, of a startling, yet interesting, figure in Egyptian monachism. Bornemann and Eichhorn were the earlier critics of Weingarten and of English writers, who had accepted his conclusions; the others have carried further the investigations begun in their treatises, by a closer study of original material. The main results of these inquiries may be seen in the articles contributed by Nestle to the third edition of the *Realencyclopädie* and the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.* A review of Butler's *Palladius* by C. H. Turner in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (vol. vi, pp. 321–55) is full and suggestive.

The theory which Weingarten puts forward in Herzog's *Realencyclopädie* (second edition), that all the earlier accounts of the rise of monachism are of a legendary and mythical character, is now almost completely discredited. Closer inquiry has proved that monachism had its origin in that spirit of asceticism which from Origen's time had been a ruling power in Christian life. There were, it is true, outside the Christian Church, tendencies working in the same direction, both Greek and Jewish. Yet there were no monasteries. The fact of the rise of monastic communities in remote Coptic regions, where philosophy had no hold, and severe Christian endeavour was very marked, disproves the theory that Greek philosophy had any great influence in their formation. Ascetic philosophy taught that nearness to the divine depended upon freedom from matter; while ascetic Christianity taught that it depended on freedom from sin as found in an evil world and in the flesh. The Christian monastic communities were thus swayed by a different conception of the nature of evil from that which prevailed in heathen circles.

St. Anthony now appears in the background as a real personage; he is what Athanasius believed him to be, and a glorified idea of him, half unreal, was carried to Britain. His followers lived apart in cell, ravine, or cave, perpetuating the separate life on a large scale in the desert of Nitria. Paladius visited the great colony of eremites, scattered throughout that valley, one here by himself another there,

sometimes two or three occupying the same cell. From an eminence, at the ninth hour (*nona*, British *nawn*), he listened to the voices of song and praise which rose from the scattered cells, until he felt, so he says, as one raised up to paradise.

Far from Nitria, in the heart of Upper Egypt and near the modern Denderah, Pachomius, soon after his baptism, founded the monastery which formed the beginning of a coenobitic or common life of monks.[1] Before long, at Tabennisi, as the place was called, Pachomius found his disciples, a large number of whom had been anchorites, crowding around him by hundreds. In their voluntary subjection to him as abbot—*abbas*, which means father—and their acceptance of one *regula*, they formed what was afterwards called an order of monks. Before his death, these institutions, for men and for women, had become nine in number, which included within their walls a host to be counted by thousands. There were also the monks of the Scetic desert, of Cellia and Oxyrhynchus; the whole record leaves upon the mind the impression that before A. D. 400 Egypt was teeming with ascetics. Anthony had a famous successor in Macarius, and Theodore carried on the work of Pachomius, so that there were in Egypt two types of the monastic life. One of these, the Antonian, seems to have reproduced itself in the British *Llan*, *Llansant*, Llan*ddeu*sant, *Llanpumpsaint*, &c., the small hut where one, two, three, or more lived the hermit life; the other is evidenced by the tradition which leads the biographer of St. David to describe his monastery as a place where he 'followed the monks of Egypt, leading a life similar to theirs'—*Egyptios monachos imitatus similem eis duxit vitam*.[2]

[1] Monastery (τὸ μοναστήριον) properly denotes a place where one man lives alone, and the term is used in this sense by Eusebius in his account of the Essenes, where he is probably borrowing from Philo (*H. E.* ii. 17. 9). But as generally understood in Greek and Latin it had the same meaning as τὸ κοινόβιον (*coenobium*), or a place where a community observe, in their religious life, the same fixed rules, and yield obedience to one superior. Cassian, *Collationes*, xviii. 10, gives, by the mouth of Abbot Pianum, an explanation of the terms.

[2] *Vita David, Cambro-British Saints*, p. 129.

The *Vita Pachomii*, and the *Regula Pachomii*, in some one or other of its recensions, became well known in the western parts of Europe, with the result that in most countries the Egyptian ideal of monachism was generally favoured. Parmenian, the friend of Sulpicius Severus, travelled thither, so also did Cassian and Honoratus, for by this time Egypt had become, as it were, a second Holy Land where men had, it was held, realized to a remarkable extent the Christian aim by their severe ascetic life of meditation, work and self-discipline.

Honoratus settled on the small island of Lerins (*Lerinus* or *Lerinum*), and founded a community there. But the exact date cannot be fixed from his Life (*Vita Honorati*), written by his friend Hilarius of Arles, even when supplemented by the references in Eucher. Nevertheless the motives and ideals which influenced him are clearly recognizable. Almost as uncertain is the exact time when John Cassian founded a monastery near Marseilles, though it seems to have been some few years before 415. Neither of them can have become widely known before 420; shortly after this date we have Cassian dedicating the Second Part of the famous *Collationes*—his Conversations with Egyptian monks—to Honoratus and Eucher. They were the outcome of long personal acquaintance with the East, at the time it was attracted to this peculiar form of obeying the religious call of Christian precepts, particularly as this type was taught by Coptic solitaries and monks. John Cassian, by writing his two works[1] the *Institutes* and *Collationes*, did more than found a monastery. He was a deeply devout man, filled with earnest admiration of what he had witnessed on two visits to Egypt, so that his works caused the ideals of that land to circulate throughout the west of Europe.

John Cassian helps us to connect first the southern coast of Gaul, then our own country, with the institutions of Egypt. But it should be observed that the monasteries at

[1] *Instituta Coenobiorum et Octo principalium Vitiorum Remedia*; *Collationes* written about 420–30, published in C. S. Lat. of Berlin.

Marseilles and Lerins, as well as those on the numerous islands of the neighbourhood, could not have attained their powers of attractiveness and propagation much before 420–425, and thus the inference may be safely drawn that Britain saw her earliest monks during those years. We need not confine our notice to these parts of South Gaul. The ideals had penetrated other lands. St. Augustine, to his great surprise, at the time when he read the *Vita Antonii*, discovered that outside the walls of Milan there was a monastery full of good brethren and favoured by Ambrose, their great bishop.[1] This was in 387.

Monachism of a more characteristically Gallic type had been practised by St. Martin in the country between the Loire and the Seine. By a pious ruse he was compelled to become Bishop of Tours, yet with all the honours and burdens of this office, the severe rigour of the simple monk was never relaxed. His disciple and biographer, Sulpicius Severus, draws, in the *Vita Martini*, a favourable contrast between St. Martin and the monks of Egypt: 'Always, and as long as I have life, I will speak the praise of Egyptian monks, I will laud anchorites, will admire eremites. Of Martin I will ever make an exception. With no monk will I compare him, certainly with no one of the bishops.' M. Boissier remarks of him how, though an unlettered man, yet possessing a *grand sens*, his influence was immense; he impressed his contemporaries as a man who did the right thing at all times. 'Many miracles were performed by him, but these miracles in no way resembled those of the solitaries of the Thebaid, which had no use or profit to any one. . . . Martin placed charity above all powers. The *grande affaire* for him was to visit the suffering, to succour the unhappy, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked.'[2] There were, Sulpicius informs us, 2,000 monks gathered together on the day of his burial. The learned and refined Sulpicius Severus himself yielded with joy to the marvellous spiritual sway of

[1] He had never heard even the name of Anthony: 'de Antonio Aegyptio monacho, cuius nomen excellenter clarebat apud servos tuos; nos autem usque in illam horam latebat,' *Confess.* viii. 6.

[2] *La Fin du Paganisme*, ii, pp. 65–70. Cf. *Vita Martini*, 2.

this unlettered ascetic so far as to make a willing sacrifice of all his bright prospects, Aquitanian noble though he was; he retired to a house he had converted into a monastery at Primutiacum, making frequent pilgrimages to the grave of St. Martin at Tours. Paulinus of Nola,[1] the intimate friend of Sulpicius, might also be named as a monk of earnest piety, a man of refinement, gifted with a true, though slender, vein of poetry. While in many ways a simple child, he was like St. Martin great in charity, preserving a close friendship with unlikely personages, not only with Niceta of Remesiana, the author of the Te Deum, and Prudentius the Christian poet, but also with Rufinus and Jerome, with Pelagius and Augustine. These men remind us of Wordsworth's lines:—

> The calm delights
> Of unambitious piety he chose,
> And learning's solid dignity.

Monachism was taking possession of Gaul. But it was not the monachism of such men as those just mentioned that came to Britain; it was another and a fiercer kind, characterized by a more extreme rigour, and tending to create that habit of severe personal strictness which has always exercised a spiritual influence in Celtic circles. It came from the south of Gaul, and before long 'the saints' of Gaul were regarded in Britain and Ireland with the reverence which the monks of Egypt had heretofore evoked in Gaul and Spain. Lerins and Marseilles, with the neighbouring places, became a third Holy Land as Egypt had become the second. In its hold on the emotional side lay its chief source of mastery over Celtic minds, intensifying the Christian ideal of severe self-denial. But it lacked coherence and continuity. The communities, as a rule, were originated by this or that gifted man on his own initiative and, largely, with his own peculiar ideas respecting the discipline and common life required in a monastery. This was a legacy inherited from Egyptian and Gallic sources. After a time, with the free organization of St. Benedict, came relief, not

[1] Cf. Bigg's delightful essay in *Wayside Sketches in Church History*.

only to France and Germany, but also to Britain. The old primitive British monachism, having fulfilled its course, died away, though not without regret and protests, leaving behind it honourable names which still survive.

Religion, as we have seen, assumed a new form, in this island no less than elsewhere, when monachism began to absorb into itself ecclesiastical energy. But it is probable that the process of absorption was carried further here than in other parts of Western Europe. From *c.* 200 to *c.* 420 A. D. the religious life of Christians had run within the lines prescribed by such organization of the Church as existed before the third century. Bishop, presbyter, and deacon, probably also subdeacon, lector, and exorcist, had been the sole guides of the Christian faithful. But now the ascetic ideal with its monastery or solitary cell became paramount. It had been in the ascendant in the schools of Neo-Platonic philosophy. Bishop, presbyter, and deacon were never excluded, but in public opinion they took a place of secondary importance.

Monachism had within it elements that were felt to be antagonistic to the very essence of a Church. As men fled into the desert, abandoning the world with its wickedness, they abandoned also the Church itself, with its ritual and Sacraments, which were not simply profitable, but, as was taught, even necessary for salvation. Brotherhood, common worship, sacramental benefit, the teaching and guidance of bishop and clergy, disappeared through the emphasis laid upon abstinence and constant prayer for the profit of the individual soul. The idea of a religious life, of which the essence was ascetic rigour in cell or monastery, seems to limit the idea of the Church as a visible organized society. We find some great men, such as Athanasius, foreseeing and providing against this danger;[1] Councils also were alive to it, which by their canons made the monasteries more or less subject to episcopal authority. In far-off places, such as Britain, with passion of Celtic ardour, austere and sincere, to be

[1] I refer to the well-known *Epistola ad Dracontium*, written by Athanasius in 354 or 355.

taken into account, it can easily be grasped how great was the danger of the Church's obliteration by the new movement. But the movement was not strong when Gildas wrote. 'I make exception,' he says, 'of a few—very few—who, owing to the loss of the vast multitude which rushes daily to hell, are counted at so small a number, that our revered mother, the Church, does not, in a manner, observe them as they rest in her bosom. They (the monks) are the only real children she has.' Further on he writes: 'Yet, as I have already said in the former part, I crave pardon of those whose life I not only praise, but even prefer to all the wealth of the world, of which, if possible, some time before I die, I desire and thirst to become partaker.'[1] The freshness of these words, the utter absence of the conventional language of monasticism, is impressive.

The work of Gildas is addressed, in denunciation of their wickedness, in the first place to rulers, and in the second to bishops. There is no address to monks. Bishops, presbyters, and deacons are, to him, the regular and recognized teachers and guides of the Church, which he affectionately calls 'our revered mother'. A little later, still in the age of Gildas, which is also the age of St. David and Samson, the present writer believes a great change came to pass, of which we find witness in the PENITENTIALS, a noteworthy type of disciplinary regulations connected especially with Britain and Ireland.

It is advisable to insert here some remarks made by Archbishop Ussher, who quotes from a MS. which seems to connect the beginnings of British monachism with Germanus and Lupus, whose visit to our shores took place in 429. The MS. asserts that Germanus and Lupus received the *Cursus Gallorum*, the mode in which the Psalms were to be recited day by day, from John Cassian and the Fathers of the monastery of Lerins. 'These courses,' he asserts, 'they themselves followed in their own churches, and taught among the British and Irish—*in Britannis vel Scotiis*.'[2] We

[1] Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, cc. 26, 65. He was then a monk, but sighed for the more complete seclusion of the hermit.

[2] *Works*, vol. v, p. 394, or c. xi.

read here of Churches, but the lengthy recital of Psalms day by day became before long, as it had been in Egypt, a distinguishing feature of the services carried on in the monasteries. This very word, *cursus*, appears, at a later time, in the *Regula* prepared for his monks by the Irish abbot Columbanus.[1] Another peculiarity, also traceable to Egypt, may be noticed: in the monasteries the Scriptures were not only read, but also learned by heart. Palladius, in the *Historia Lausiaca*, gives the interesting information that the Tabennesiot monks learnt the whole of the Scriptures; and the Latin *Regula* of Pachomius prescribes that no one was allowed to stay in a monastery who did not learn by heart at least the Psalter and the New Testament. Some part of the Scriptures, as Jerome narrates in the extract given below, was daily committed to memory, and several of the Lives of British Saints describe this as part of the training of young monks. Such a course must have been strictly followed in the monastery of Illtud, where Gildas was trained, as a close study of his numerous citations proves.

The objective of a monastery was spiritual discipline. Prayer took place at regular hours; in the intervals times were fixed for meditation and for manual labour. By all these exercises, it was believed, a man would attain to great sanctity. The system was often compromised by grave delinquencies on the part of those who had taken its vows, but the heaviest censures upon these, and revelations of unworthy deeds, come from men who were themselves monks. Contemporary opinion good-naturedly condoned much of this as being a frailty common to all mankind. Next, as to the monk's manual labour; he was expected to work, not, however, for profit, not for any material return, but for his own moral discipline. From the Lausiac History it is known that the following crafts occupied the monks at the Akhmim monastery: agriculture, gardening, smithwork, baking, carpentry, fulling, weaving, tanning, shoemaking, writing. The product of such labours provided them with food and clothing, both of which became the common property of the community.

[1] *Regula*, edited by Scebass, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, c. 7.

The interior life of a monastery, the dress assumed, the period of novitiate, &c., may be gathered from John Cassian's *Institutes*, from the preface of which we learn also that he introduced moderating changes, whereby the old severities of Egypt were set aside, and the system was made more suitable to the temperament of a Gallic people. A more complete account, and less prolix, perhaps, may be obtained from Jerome's *Epistola* 22, addressed to Eustochium, the daughter of Paula, one of those many Roman ladies of high rank who were attracted by and practised the monastic aims and life.

'There are in Egypt,' he writes, 'three kinds of monks, coenobites (*coenobitae*), anchorites (*anachoretae*), and a third called Remoboth.' Putting aside the second and third class, he returns to the first, who form the majority. 'Their first compact is to obey their superiors, and to do whatever they command. They are divided into tens and hundreds, so that the tenth man shall be at the head of nine, and the hundredth shall have ten provosts (*propositi*) under him. They dwell apart in separate cells. Until the ninth hour (3 p.m.) no one visits another, with the exception of these leaders of tens (*decani*) whom we have mentioned, so that if any one happen to be perturbed in mind he may have consolation by conversation with the *decanus*. After the ninth hour they meet in common. Psalms are sung, the Scriptures are read according to custom, and when the prayers are ended and all are seated again, he whom they call father, in their midst, begins to speak. As he speaks so great is the silence that no one looks at another, no one dares to cough. The praise of the speaker is in the weeping of the hearers; silent tears roll down the faces, grief does not break forth even into a sob. But when he begins to speak of the Kingdom of Christ, of the future blessedness and the glory that is to come, you may see that all, with suppressed sigh, and eyes raised to heaven, are saying within themselves: 'Who will give me wings like a dove, and I shall fly, and be at rest?' The gathering then separates, and each ten (*decuria*) with their head proceed to the tables. At meals there is no noise, no one speaks

while eating; they live on bread, pulse, and herbs, seasoned only with salt. Only the old have wine, whose meal is often taken with young children, so that the tired age of the former may be upheld, and that of the latter be not broken at its beginning. Then all rise together, and, singing a hymn, return to their cells, where each one holds conversation with his friends until the hour of vespers (*vespera*). . . . The day's work is fixed; this is returned to the *decanus*, and carried to the steward (*oeconomus*), who, every month, with great trembling, renders an account to the father of all (the *abbot*), and by him also all foods, when cooked, are tasted. . . . Lord's days are given entirely to prayer and reading, and this is done at all times when work is finished. Every day some part of Scripture is learnt by heart.'

But monachism, notwithstanding its high purpose, had its failures. It attracted to itself many ease-loving, dishonest, covetous men and women; there were monks who spread discontent and murmuring against authority. No writer is more unsparing than Jerome in unveiling this meaner side of the system. John Cassian is equally free, and the frankness of Palladius is remarkable. The following words by the Benedictine editor of the *Historia Lausiaca* will illustrate these grave defects in the great history of Christian ascetic vigour, during the centuries to which our attention is devoted: "Even in the case of the most illustrious monks, the difficulties, temptations, and struggles which they underwent are narrated with a simplicity at times verging on rudeness; and the weakness, failures and fall of many are freely chronicled. If anywhere, we should look for an ideal state of things in the great convent for women established a generation previously by Pachomius; but Palladius' picture of the inner life of this convent is by no means ideal; a nun there committed suicide on account of a calumny wilfully uttered against her by a sister; another, who pretended to be foolish, was treated with great unkindness by several of the sisters, and made the object of rude practical jokes. Again, it may be thought that

there is a curious touch of nature in Palladius' account of Dorotheus, who was chaplain or director of another convent of nuns, and used to sit without ceasing at a window that overlooked the convent, striving to keep the peace among them. Indeed, it can be clearly seen from Palladius' pages that, in the midst of prevalent asceticism, and together with much real holiness, a great deal of human nature survived in the desert.'[1]

Nevertheless many of the greatest souls of the fourth and fifth centuries were irresistibly attracted by the new movement, and its progress, in spite of many faults, elevated the age. The Christian of to-day is grateful for the high devotional and spiritual tone which pervades the *Collationes* of John Cassian; yet he may at the same time affirm his freedom to choose and follow different ideals if they subserve the spiritual needs of the present time.

My task, however, in these pages is to narrate, and where possible to explain. Native sources of information will show us that very soon Dyfrig (*Dubricius*), Illtud (*Iltutus*), Gildas, Saint David, Samson and others, appear as monks no less than as ministers of the Church. The present chapter, for that reason, has attempted the explanation necessary to understand this new feature, which so marked these men of the early Church in Britain and the legions of spiritually-minded men whom the Britons called 'Saints'.

[1] Dom Cuthbert Butler, *Historia Lausiaca*, i, p. 190.

CHAPTER XVII

BRITISH TERMS INDICATIVE OF MONACHISM

An examination of the literature of British and Armorican writers, including also under the term literature certain Chartularies, such as the *Book of Llandâv* or the *Chartulary of Landevennec* in Brittany, at once reveals the fact that monachism has left its mark, and that by no means an insignificant one, upon the British tongue. We observe, from the almost universal prevalence of terms derived from monachism, how far-reaching the influence of monastic institutions must have been. And to those terms must be added the host of ordinary place-names which exist to-day throughout Devon, Cornwall, and other parts of England, but especially in Wales and Brittany. These traces of monachism are older than any derived from Saxon or old Anglo-Roman sources could be, and meet the observant traveller everywhere on his way. Rivers, brooks and wells, parishes, farmsteads, hills and glens now bear names given them some time about the sixth century, if not earlier. A name is frequently the oldest and only surviving memorial of a far-off past. The buildings of British monachism have long ago disappeared, and the ruins we visit, though stately and awe-inspiring, never belonged to those particular homes of ascetic life to which the reader's attention is directed in these pages. Even the configuration of the earth's surface has changed. Broad estuaries of rivers have become grazing land; islands have become headlands; what was then a desert, whither the solitary hermit repaired, is now rich cultivated land. All visible traces of the past are gone, but the *names* survive, along with many interesting legends.

It will, I believe, be helpful to offer here a brief explanation of certain terms and phrases which have been

preserved of the language spoken in those ancient monasteries. There can be no doubt that the official language (if that term be applicable) employed by those British monks, and certainly their liturgic language, was Latin. The monks corresponded with one another, read the Scriptures publicly and privately, sang their hymns, uttered their prayers, all in Latin. Their theology and the stories of the Saints could only be in that tongue, and Gildas, as will be pointed out later on, affords evidence of both. Many words and phrases, originally Latin, would of necessity be taken for ordinary use into the native tongue, while the places whence the preachers came, and all the accessories of their peculiar way of living, at first naturally received a Latin nomenclature. But the Lives (*Vitae sanctorum*) here and there describe the saints as preaching and teaching in their own tongue. The Latin terms which they nevertheless introduced, in course of time, would undergo changes. These have been closely investigated by Celtic scholars, and I subjoin a number of terms, Latin and British, connected with monachism.[1]

1. *Llan, lanna, lan.* This word meets the eye of every traveller in Cornwall, Wales, and Brittany. In English counties also, especially in the border county of Cheshire, and to some extent in Lancashire, we meet with it sporadically.[2] Llan is not a Britonized Latin name, but is the British form of a word found in several Indo-European languages. In English it is *landa* or *land*, but in the early British tongue it appears as *lanna*, and later, *lann*, *lan*, or *llan*. At first it denoted *land* as appropriated for a definite purpose, a meaning it bears at the present day in many Welsh compounds. *Ydlan* is the place where corn is stacked, *perllan* means orchard, *gwinllan* is vineyard, and *coedlan* woodland. But *lanna Helduti* or *lanna Ilduti* becomes Lan Illtud, meaning the *lanna* or *land* appropriated by Illtud, as abbot, to be the site of a

[1] A handy, yet scholarly, work on this subject is Loth's *Les mots latins dans les Langues britanniques*, Paris.

[2] Landican, a township in Cheshire, Landechene in Domesday; Lancarn: *Ormerod*, ii. 525; Lanselyn, also in Cheshire.

monastery. Then the *lanna*, *lan*, or *llan*, designates the building, so erected, on the appropriated land. This change of designation from land to building must have taken place long before the time of Ildutus himself, that is, before A.D. 500. With this special meaning the word is used everywhere in Brittany, in connexion with the names of the earliest settlers, as well as of the latest, who joined in the Armorican emigration. The author, for instance, of the *Vita Pauli Leonensis* speaks of *Lanna Pauli*, and then proceeds to explain the term as meaning 'the monastery of Paul'. Briocus is described in his *Vita* as building churches *per totam terram*, but also as having erected a *locus* 'which is named *Landa magna*', that is, *Llan-fawr*. We observe here that *locus* itself means monastery, as it does in Mediaeval Welsh, and *llan* does not mean church. One of the Lives contains the significant statement that *monasterium Ilduti* was called *by the people*, that is, in their own language, *Lan Illtud*, from which we conclude that *Lan* Illtud, or if we turn to Brittany, *Lan*devennec or *Lan*dyvrydoc, was regarded as a *British* appellation. *Llog* or *log* and *monasterium* are Latin; the latter, however, has not found a home in the native tongue of Britain, while *locus* has. It will be noticed that the *lans* mentioned so far are connected with the names of their founders, but in some cases the other part of the compound is descriptive, such as *Lan-coit*, or *Coet-lann*, of which we have several instances, and the latter form, in the *Life of Gildas*, is also explained as *monasterium nemoris*, i. e. 'the monastery of the grove'.[1] *Lan-taf* is the monastery on the Taf, and so *Lan Elwy*, the monastery on the Elwy.

In its third signification *lan* is also identical with 'church', though it also still retained its older meaning of monastery. Of this there are copious proofs in the *Book of Llandâv*. Thus the term *lan* has been considered in its three leading meanings—land, monastery, church; its other

[1] In the *Life of Gildas* the name is *Coet-lann*, which may denote simply woodland, but the biographer's note expresses the meaning he and his people attached to *lann*. Lan-coit in Modern Welsh is Llangoed. The *Book of Llandâv* affords numerous instances.

applications to parish church, and, in a territorial sense, to the parish itself, may be held to be later than the *Taxatio* of Pope Nicholas in the ninth century.

Not a few English writers have fallen into error with respect to names of churches in which *lan*, or, as we write and pronounce the word, *llan*, occurs; many Welsh writers have followed them because guided by the same mistaken idea. In the history of the English Church, individual churches take their names by dedication, but only a very small minority of British church-names are memorials of dedication. The name in British generally implies foundation, not dedication; for instance, a monastery or cell, which in time became a church, was founded by one named in Latin Paternus, in British Padarn, and consequently was named at first Lan Patarn, now Llanbadarn. There was no dedication. A retiring monk, probably with a small troop of companions, once settled on the lonely promontory of the Great Orme, and built, not a church, but a small monastery there; his name was Tudno, and therefore that monastery was named the '*lan* of Tudno', Llandudno, so that when the monastic building became also a church (*ecclesia*), where the Sacraments were administered and public worship conducted, its name in the British tongue continued to be, as before, Llandudno.

2. *Mynach*, *monachus*. Here we have a Latin word in British form. An ancient instance of its plural appears in the *Book of St. Chad*. This MS. contains an Old Latin text of the Gospels, and was written about A.D. 700. For over a century, under the name of Llyfr Teilo, *The Book of Teilo*,[1] it was the property of the Church of Llandâv. The marginal notes inserted during the time the Gospel codex was at Llandâv[2] have been transcribed and printed

[1] See the old British Charter on p. 120 of Gwenogfryn Evans's *Book of Llandâv*, where we read *escop Teliau* in the sense of 'bishop of Teilo', as the Latin on p. 119 proves, *episcopo sancti Teliaui*. Thus the church itself is called by the name of its founder or first bishop; so also we have *Abbas Ilduti*, &c. The name 'Llyfr Teilo', therefore, implies no connexion with Teilo, the contemporary of Dewi Sant.

[2] Henceforth, in concurrence with general use, the spelling Llandâv will be used for Llandâf.

by Dr. Gwenogfryn Evans in his edition of the compilation called *Liber Landavensis*, or *Book of Llandâv*. On p. xlv we read *minih*, which Sir John Rhys conjectures to be the equivalent of *minich*, since the early mediaeval *h* stands for the modern *ch* as well as *h*. Thus, from what might be *menech*, come the plurals *menech*, *meneich*, and *menechi*. The *Life of Gildas* has preserved the first of these in the name *Loch-menech*, with the explanatory addition *id est locus monachorum*.[1] The second appears in *Lan-meneich* of Brittany, and the third in the *Lan-menechi* of the *Book of Llandâv*.

The Latin *nonna*, English *nun*, is represented by *non*, or by *lluan*, *llian*, *lleian*, as also by *gwyryf* or *gwyrydd*, which give us the names *Llan-llianau* (nunnery) and *Llan-wyryfon* or *Llan-weryddon*,[2] with the same meaning.

3. *Mynachlog*, *mynachdy*. Very strangely, as has been noticed, *monasterium* has found no place among the terms used by the Britons; their word was a native one—*llan*. *Mynachlog* is evidently the same as *monachi locus*, *log* being British for *locus*. Very frequently, in the British Lives, *locus* itself, with no addition, denotes a monastery, and appears also in Welsh mediaeval writings as *llog*, for the same. The *Black Book* addresses a reckless personage:—

'Ni phercheist ti creirieu na lloc na llaneu.'[3]

(Thou respectedst not relics, nor monastery, nor churches.)

In Brittany *locus* holds the same place as *lan*, so that Loc Gueltas on Morbihan Bay, and Loc Ronan further north, still represent a locus Giltae or locus Ronani of ancient days. Besides *loc* it is possible that *lech* also may be a British form of *locus*. The *Life of Gildas* uses *Lech*-menech as well as *Loch*-menech to denote the same monastery; the *Book of Llandâv* mentions *lech meneich*, *lech Oudocei*, *lech Bichlyt*, *lech Libiau*, of which the first is equivalent to Llandyfrgwyr, the abode of the seven *dufuyr-*

[1] *Vita Gildae*, Cymmrodorion edition, p. 372.

[2] See *Black Book of Caermarthen*, p. 71, Evans's edition:

'O pleid cofion naut meir gwiri ar gueriton.'

[3] See further instances of *lloc* or *llog*, *Myvyrian Archaeology* (Gee's edition), pp. 142, 177, 178.

gwyr or *dybrgwyr*, so called because 'they had been found in the water and saved by water'. These were seven men, baptized by Teilo, who lived their solitary life on the bank of the Taf. Every morning the seven fishes necessary for their simple fare were found on a stone or slab, for which reason the place was called Lech-meneich—the Monks' slab. Such is the story in the *Book of Llandâv*, but it is unmistakably an instance of a story expressly invented, as in scores of other cases, to explain a name. On p. 129 of the same book, it is said that Teilo sent these seven to another *locus*, called Mathru in Pepidiawc, i. e. 'another monastery', where they were known as 'the Seven Saints of Mathru'.[1]

The term survives at the present day in many place-names, such as Llech-eiddior, Llech-ylched, Llech-genfarwydd, Llech-gower, Cae-llech.

The second term mentioned above—*mynachdy*, *ty* being for *tig* = house—is connected with such names as Ty Ddewi (Dewi's monastery, St. David's). The *Chartulary of Quimperle*, in Brittany, refers to a monastery as *manacty*, and the word is still preserved there in the name Pont-manety, while many a farm in Wales is now called Mynachdy.

4. *Cil*, *Kil*. This word, which, like some of those others already mentioned, appears only in compounds, is a British form of the Latin *cella*, English cell, a term historically connected with monachism in its earliest appearance. St. Columba was called Columcille, meaning the Dove of the Cille, that is, of the cell. *Cil* in Irish is generally *Kil*, but in ancient times the word had the form *cell*.[2] In the *Book of Llandâv* Cella Cyngualan and Lann Cyngualan are names for the same monastery (or church). St. David's in Irish and British documents is called Kil-muine, that is Kil-mynyw. There is also a Cilsant—the monk's cell—near Caerlleon-on-Usk. Other instances might easily be added of present-day names.

[1] 'Misit eos ad alium locum qui vocatur Mathru in Pepitiauc, et ibi vocati sunt seith seint Mathru.' See also pp. 159, 339, &c., *Black Book of Caermarthen*, p. 46.

[2] *Ceall* is a late form; the Irish was *cell*: gen. *cille*, dat. acc. *cill*; as place-names generally occur in the dative (locative) *Kil-* becomes the usual prefix.

Clas for *claustrum* may be added; hence *Tir clas*; *claswyr*, ecclesiastics.

5. *Disart* or *Disserth*. The meaning of Disart, which is always a feminine noun, has been obscured by the modern spelling—*Dyserth*, which would tend to connect it with *serth* in the sense of 'steep'. It is of frequent occurrence in Irish names of parishes and townships, occupying the same position as our Llan, denoting the desert (*desertum*) or, as it is written, the *disart* sought by a recluse as a place to discipline himself in lonely sanctity.[1] Columbanus, writing to Gregory the Great, asks his advice respecting the monks who had left 'the place of their conversion', that is, their monasteries, for the desert, drawn by 'the fervour peculiar to monks—*fervore monachorum cogente*'. Such a desert, selected by a solitary, was called by the Britons *Disart* or *Disserth*. In *Brut y Tywysogion* we read 'yn ymyl y Disserth yn Tegeygel'—near the Disserth in Tegengyl.[2]

A few others, besides this Disart of Flintshire, have survived.

6. *Côr, Bangor*. Bangor has become a proper name, just as Disart has, for several places. There were at least two monasteries, both dating from the sixth century, and both bearing the name Bangor. Deiniol (Daniel) of the Bangor in Carnarvonshire is connected, according to the *Book of Llandâv*, with Dyfrig (Dubricius), and may, with some amount of certainty, be regarded as beginning his pastoral life before the middle of the sixth century. The other Bangor, in Flintshire, called Bangor-is-y-coed, is known first of all from the pages of Beda, in his account of the two conferences held between Augustine of Canterbury and the British bishops. There were present at the second 'seven British bishops, and many men of great learning, from their most celebrated monastery, which is called in the English tongue, Bancorna-

[1] See Stokes, *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, p. 178.

[2] *Brut*, Evans's edition, p. 369. As *synodus* became *sinodus* and *senodus*, so *desertum* became *disertum*. Even the plural *deserta*, i.e. *diserta*, might come, as *biblia* and a great number of Latin neuter plurals, to be regarded as a singular feminine. The people call the hamlet Disart, never Dyserth.

burg, over which the Abbot Dinoot is said to have presided at that time'. Some historians make Abbot Dunawd or Dunod (forms of the Latin *Donatus*) to be father of Deiniol, the abbot-bishop of the other Bangor. This, however, is impossible, were it only because of the spiritual strictness which attended the public preaching of Dewi Sant, Gildas, Samson, Teilo, and others, including Deiniol himself; but further, Deiniol, if we accept the evidence of the *Book of Llandâv*, was a disciple of Dubricius, and contemporary of Illtud, the master of Gildas and Dewi Sant. Bangor, or Bancor, might have had a long existence as a *civitas*—such is the term in the *Book of Llandâv*—also as monastery and church before the time of Deiniol, its reputed first bishop, just as there had been bishops at St. David's before David.

When we turn to Irish documents, the greater Bancor, for the word is a generic term, was Bennchor Uladh, situated on the southern shore of Belfast Lough, in Ard Uladh, in what is now County Down.[1] We meet with the word also in the genitive as Ben*chuir*, Bend*chair*, Benn*chair*, and as an adjective Benchorensis. The oldest form in Irish writings, both in the *Annals* and the *Antiphonary of Bangor*, where Comgall[2] is mentioned as founder and first abbot, is Benchor, genitive Bennchair, or Benchuri. By all these forms the same meaning of monastery is implied. I quote one only of 'the verses of the Family of Benchuir' which plainly indicates the character of the place so called, and the high reputation in which it stood.

'Benchuir bona regula,
Recta, atque divina,
Stricta, sancta, sedula,
Summa, iusta ac mira.'[3]

[1] See Warren's edition of the *Antiphonary of Bangor*, the Service Book of the monastery, ff. 15 verso, 30 recto, 36 verso. The *Antiphonary* has been published by the Henry Bradshaw Society. The MS. was first printed by Muratori in 1713; it was written about A. D. 680–91 in Ireland, but it is preserved in the Ambrosian Library at Milan. Some unknown Irish ecclesiastic carried it over from Bangor to the Irish house at Bobbio, whence it passed to Milan.

[2] Comgallus, Congallus, or Comgillus is designated *Abbas Benchorensis. Vita Aa. Ss.* Mai ii. 578.

[3] Jonas, *Vitae Columbani*, Libri II, p. 3. The good rule of Bangor in Ultonia, i. e. the Ulster Bangor, is referred to.

We find several suggestive names in Breton Lives, such as *Tricorium* (Treguier), *Vercorium Perrucori*, *Tolosocorium*, which suggest an original *corio*—with the implication of crowd or host. The Irish *benn* is the British *bann*, *ban*, in the sense of chief, so that Bennchor or Bancor was a word applied to a *chief* place where *many* were gathered together, in contrast to the solitary one or two eremites. The Welsh Iolo MSS. contain the exceedingly strange statement that the Bangors existed before the monasteries, and that a place in ceasing to be a 'bangor' became a monastery. A statement of this kind is hardly credible.[1]

7. *Meudwy*, *ermid*, *didrifwr*, *didryf*. These terms denote a recluse, but it is difficult to determine whether they are old. The first, frequent in place-names, is explained as a form of *mag-dwy(v)*, servant of God. The Mabinogi of Pryderi gives us 'cuddygyl meudwy', and *cuddygyl* is known as Cuddygl or Cuddyg in 'Cwm Cuddyg'. Ermid, from *eremita*, survives in at least one place-name—*Bod-ermid* near Aberdaron. *Didryf* stands both for a recluse and for the place of his solitary life. In the Welsh *Brut* of Geoffrey (p. 203) we have *didrifwr*: 'kanys gwell oed gantaw bot yn didrifwr a buchedu yn y didryf'; we read also, 'myneich a didrifwyr' (p. 238).

8. *Seint*, *Sant*, *sanctus*. In the New Testament the term 'saint' is used by St. Paul, near the end of his life, as an appellation for believers.[2] All *fideles*, that is, all believers, are saints. But when the persecutions were over, or even earlier, a new application of the name took place, wherein those who had suffered death, imprisonment, or other cruelties for the name of Christ were called, as if to give them unique pre-eminence, 'the saints.' In Constantine's 'Address to the Holy Assembly', c. 12, to name no other writing, the term is used in this special sense and even their invocation is alluded to. By 'saints' he means the martyrs.

[1] Iolo MSS., pp. 103–14, where we have mention of Cor and Bangor Cattwg, Cor and Bangor Cybi, Bangor Cadfan yn Enlli, Bangor Clynog, Bangor Dunawd, Bangor Dewdws, Bangor Ylltud, Bangor Deinioel, &c. These documents are late, yet there may be *some* truth in the statement.

[2] See Col. i. 1 and Eph. i. 1; *fideles* are *sancti*, ἅγιοι.

But further a new idea of sanctity came into use with the spread of asceticism. In post-Constantinian times, there were certain prominent personalities in whom, it was felt, the highest ideals of religion and morality had been reached, and expressed, in their austerities, unworldly aims, lofty conceptions and teaching. Heaven itself was around these 'servants of God', so that the hermit's cell or the monastery was the natural home of a saint. Above all men they seemed to preserve the hallowed self-sacrifice of the ancient martyrs, and, in all, to furnish the world an ideal of Christian sanctity. Hence to them also the term so long associated with the martyrs was applied; they, too, were reverently called 'the saints'.

Nowhere was the expression so frequently used, and particularly in this special sense, as in Britain. The language furnishes only a few examples of the ordinary English epithet, Saint Stephen, Saint John, &c., and that where the name is the name of a stranger, such as Sant Ffreid (*Sancta Brigitta*), or Sant Sior for St. George, or Saint Gwainerth for St. Weonard. Dewi Sant, on the other hand, can only mean the monk Dewi or David. Caradawc, in the *Book of Llandâv*, makes a gift to the four 'saints' of Lanncwm; and a *monachus* of Lanncwm figures in the Charter (p. 274). There exist at the present time Llan-saint (Monks' llan) in Carmarthen, and the already mentioned Llan-sant (monk's llan) in Glamorgan, names that must belong to the earliest period of British Monachism.

When we look into the language used by Latin writers outside Britain, in Gaul and elsewhere, it is noticeable that this custom, universal in the sixth century, had, as a matter of fact, existed as early as the fourth and fifth. Gildas, addressing Maglocunus or Maelgwn, says that the wicked prince had once, after 'meditating on the holy walk and rules of the monks', avowed himself a monk for ever. 'Thou didst profitably snatch thyself, like a dove from the raven, strongly cleaving the thin air in rustling flight, escaping the cruel claws of the speedy hawk with sinuous windings, unto the *caves of the saints*, sure retreats for thee, and places of refreshment.' This is the old phraseology

recurring in Britain: the caves of the saints—*sanctorum speluncae*—were of yore the monasteries, and the ascetics were now the saints. The monk-disciple of St. David is called 'Maydauc sant', a companion monk-bishop is 'hen escopsant'. In agreement with this meaning of *sant*, there were such names as Ynys y Saint, 'Seith seint Mathru,' Llanddeusant, Llantrisant, Llanpumpsant, and even Llandoudecsant,[1] all denoting the retreats of ascetics.

[1] *Book of Llandâv*, pp. 107, 225, 276. In the same way Bardsey was called Ynys y Saint (*insula sanctorum*), and probably also Afon Saint (*flumen sanctorum*), the 'Saints' river', on the mouth of which Caernarvon is built. *Flumen sanctorum* is certainly found in Latin; the name, always pronounced 'Afon Saint', can hardly be connected with *Segontium*; *Legionum* gives Caer legion, which is now Caerleon, and, in the *Black Book of Caermarthen*, Caer Segont seems to have become *Caer Sion*.

CHAPTER XVIII

TWO BRITAINS

Early in the sixth century the name Britannia was used with a twofold geographical designation. Our own island, bearing this ancient name, began to send forth emigrants, who carried the name with them, during the fifth century, to that part of the neighbouring coast of France which, to-day, we call Brittany. In the sixth and seventh centuries the name of that small peninsula was simply Britannia, so that, as there were two Britains, care must be taken to ascertain to which of the two reference is made on each occurrence of the term in old Lives, Missals, Breviaries, and Chartularies. We are somewhat startled, when reading some of the Lives, to meet with such a sentence as the following: 'The temples were destroyed by the teaching of Paul (Aurelian) throughout the whole of Britain—*per totam Britanniam*.' The passage, we pause to note, refers to Armorica. A touch of surprise also comes when we meet with Demetia, Dumnonia (Devon), Cornugallia (Cornwall), Bro Weroch, in narratives that treat of a corner of Gaul. An account of a Synod (*sinodus*) in the *Book of Llandâv* relates how a British prince Guidnerth, having killed his brother Merchion, was first excommunicated by Oudoceus, Bishop of Llandâv; then, after the lapse of three years, the repentant man was sent on a pilgrimage to the Archbishop of Dol in *Cornugallia*. The reason assigned is the old friendship which existed between Teilo, the predecessor of Oudoceus, and Samson, the first Archbishop of Dol. But another reason is also given, namely, that Guidnerth himself, the Britons (*Brittones*), and the archbishop of that country were of one language and one nation.[1]

[1] *Book of Llandâv*, p. 181.

No other name than *Brittones* occurs in the *Historia Francorum*, by Gregory of Tours, who was a Franc, and whose attitude towards the Brittones in the *Historia* was not unlike that of Beda towards the insular Britons in his *History of the English Church*. The old Armorica takes a significantly new name. It is called Britannia, and Britannia, as applied to it, must also have been an imported name. The people who carried it over spoke a language not found elsewhere in Gaul. It was a dialect or a mixture of several dialects, of the language which was spoken in the island of Britain. The new name implies a new nation. The civic life of Romanized Gaul can be compared with the civic life which prevailed among these new settlers, and they will be found to differ materially from each other. It is well known how the early Puritans took with them into the New England of America the church constitution and doctrines of that Reformed Church, for which they had struggled in this old England, and how their civic usages and institutions were closely blended with those of the Church. A thousand years earlier these other Brittones retain the name of the mother island, and, after settling in the new home, develop there that distinctive form of church and civic life, to which they had been accustomed here. The same form it was, but more marked. As time advanced there was, it would seem, a ferment working in Britain. The monastic life as described by Gildas, and as it existed before his day, was looked upon with prejudice and suspicion by princes and worldly bishops, consequently it must have spread among the people only in the face of considerable difficulties. A new country gave wider scope, and allowed a more active development of the ideal which the stronger spirits were eager to realize. The crossing of the Britons to Armorica led to the formation there of a Christian community, the life of which was predominantly ecclesiastical, with the monastery as the leading centre of rule and influence. This emigration resulted in a greater freedom, the desire for which was, or at least may have been, one of the causes of the inception of the movement.

After a brief summary upon the reasons assigned for this migration of the people, an attempt will be made to describe the progress in Brittany of a life that must have had its origin in British habits. Some light will thus be reflected upon religious ideas in general and monachism in particular in the older Church of Britain itself.

With these objects in view, I am led here to name works by two writers that seem to stand high above most others, as guides and helps, along with those of a third, who occupies a peculiar position, even higher than the other two. These three writers—M. J. Loth, M. Arthur de la Borderie, and M. l'Abbé Louis Duchesne—are themselves Bretons, endowed with the strong, warm sympathies of their race, and in addition enriched by a fulness of detailed knowledge in Celtic matters, guided by well-trained critical judgement. M. l'Abbé Duchesne, the editor of the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Martyrology of Jerome*, seems to know the Church chiefly from the inside ; he is especially instructive on the relations existing between these Christians of Britannia—imbued, as they were, with insular peculiarities—and the more developed church institutions of the Continent.

A list is appended of the works by which these scholars earn the historian's gratitude.

1. M. J. Loth, *L'Émigration bretonne en Armorique, du Ve au VIIe Siècle de notre Ère*, Paris. Another work on 'Latin words in the Languages of Britain' (Welsh chiefly) supplements the former: *Les Mots latins dans les Langues britanniques.*

2. M. Arthur de la Borderie, *Histoire de la Bretagne*, vol. i, Rennes. Papers in great number and printed editions of MSS. have been contributed to this subject by M. de la Borderie. But this first volume of the History, so full and exhaustive, gives us the ripe fruit of endless research.

3. M. l'Abbé Duchesne, *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, vols. i, ii. What concerns us is chiefly presented in vol. ii, pp. 241–74. Besides these volumes, which of course do not deal directly with Brittany, M. Duchesne has, at intervals, made many valuable contributions to the pages of the *Revue Celtique*, e. g. vols. x, xi, xiv.

With these it will be helpful to compare some older works. (1) *Les Vies des Saints de la Bretagne armorique*, by Albert le Grand, a friar of Morlaix, 1680. The work is uncritical but full of valuable material.

I have used the new edition (1901), with numerous modern annotations by three editors, MM. A. M. Thomas, Abgrall, and Peyron. (2) Very different from Albert le Grand's work is that of a learned eighteenth-century Benedictine, Dom Lobineau, *Les Vies des Saints de Bretagne*, Rennes, 1724. There is also an earlier work by him, *Histoire de Bretagne*, 1707. Both display a grasp and an incision that are too often absent from works with a larger mass of material. 'All Breton legends,' he maintains, 'represent a migration.'

The settlements of which we spoke lay in a tract west of a line drawn from St. Malo to Vannes through the Department of Morbihan. Between such a line and the coast we are in Britannia; beyond it, at such places as Rennes and Nantes, we are in Romania. Within this line we have on the map words that have an unmistakable British stamp, but not so to the east of it. It had three divisions—Cornubia or Cornugallia, which is identical with the Welsh Cernyw; Dumnonia, which reminds us of Devon in its ancient wide extent; Bro Waroch, with its British *bro* as signifying a district, and the British name *Waroch*, called Warocus, Warochus or Verocus, Verochus in Gregory of Tours' *Historia*.[1]

1. Some scholars rejected the theory of migration and settlement advocated above, and offered as an alternative hypothesis the persistence of the old pre-Roman population, with their ancient Celtic language, strengthened by colonies from Britain, who gave the land its later name. This is the view advanced by Dr. Freeman in the *Historical Geography of Europe* (p. 93). The opinion is no longer held; it has been proved untenable by researches in modern Celtic philology, and the study of Breton legends.

[1] I subjoin a few, very few, Breton words that are easily understood by any one familiar with Welsh:—

Ben, loc (llŏg, monastery), lan, plou (plwy), caer (civitas), pou (pau, podus; *padus civitatis* is Pou Caer, and in Welsh *civitas legionis* is Caerlleon), aber, tre, castel, Aleth (Aled). *Weroch* or *Veroch*, in that part of the Life of Gildas written by the monk of Ruys, which is evidently of the tenth or eleventh century, has become Guerecus, and the district is called Bro Guerec. Here is an instance of *w* = *gu*. See *Vita Gildae*, published by Cymmrodorion Society, cc. 20, 32.

2. The emigration has also been represented as beginning in the later years of the fourth century with the men who followed Maximus to Gaul in A.D. 383, and as continuing during the earlier half of the fifth century. This view appears in British mediaeval legends, in which were to be found stories invented to explain the latter name Lettau or Letavia, or in Modern Welsh Llydaw.

3. The majority of writers have explained the migration as due to the Saxon invasion of Britain, the successive bands of settlers being fugitives at different times from the barbarities of the conquering race. In accordance with this view, it was a movement that began within the half century 450–500, but continued for a hundred years after the latter date.

As regards the second theory, the chief difficulty will be to find a reason for any settlement by Britons at so early a date. An Irish writer, Dom Plaine, in a monograph entitled *La Colonisation de l'Armorique par les Bretons insulaires* (Paris, 1899), upholds this view, finding it, as has been stated, in several mediaeval British writers. Nennius appears to have been the first to make a statement of this kind, though it may be hinted at in Gildas. Two MSS. of the former's *Historia Brittonum* contain an amplifying interpolation (c. 27) to the effect that those Britons who had accompanied Maximus—or Maximianus, as he incorrectly gives the name—married Gallic wives, but cut their tongues, lest their children should learn their mothers' language, 'for which reason we call them, in our language, Letewicion, that is half-mutes, because they speak confusedly (*id est semitacentes quoniam confuse loquuntur*).'[1] The meaning thus assigned is intended to explain Letavia; lêt (Modern Welsh llêd), it is said, has the sense of 'partly', and *Tewicion* of 'silent ones'. But *Letewic* is, really, the same word as *Letevicus*, and means an inhabitant of Letau, that is, Letavia, which in Modern Welsh is Llydaw. Litavia or Llydaw is a name carried over by the emigrants. The idea became common that the settlements had been formed in Armorica by the British

[1] Mommsen, *Nennius*, p. 167; *Chronica Minora*, vol. iii.

forces whom Maximus led to Gaul against the Emperor Gratian, after the defeat and death of Maximus at the hands of Theodosius, or even earlier; it appears not only in Nennius, but also in Geoffrey of Monmouth, in Henry of Huntingdon, and in Giraldus Cambrensis. 'He made a second Britain, and gave it to Conanus Meridocus.' So wrote Geoffrey,[1] and others were influenced by him. Letavia is frequently employed by these writers as another name for the Armorican Britannia, and in the Welsh version of Geoffrey's *Brut Lydaw* appears as the British equivalent. The *Vita Sti. Iltuti* also has Letavia, but in the *Vita Sti. Cadoci* the name occurs twice as *Lettau* (cc. 32, 42); the author of the Life of Gildas, who is much earlier than the writers of these Lives, expressly states that *Letavia* was a name *used by the Britanni themselves*, from which we may gather that it also, like many other names of places and persons, was a name introduced into Armorica from Britain.[2] Gregory of Tours has only *Britannia* and *Britanni*; occasionally we meet with *Britto*; in other writers we have simply *Brittones* and *Brittania*, but with the same meaning, namely, that of the continental place and people. There is one objection, fatal it seems to me, to this idea of a settlement made in Gaul by the men who followed Maximus. That *tyrannus*, as Gildas calls him, took over, not troops of British youths, but the Roman legions, who were restive in their anxiety for the empire itself; among these, as is well known, there were no Britons. 'After this, Britain is robbed of her armed soldiery, of her military supplies, of her rulers, cruel though they were, of her strong youth, who followed the footsteps of the above-mentioned tyrant, and never returned.' These are the words of Gildas (c. 14), and by *ingenti iuventute spoliata* he can only mean the withdrawal of the main body of the Roman

[1] Geoffrey, *Historia*, iv. 12-15. The *Brut* translates it: 'Ac yna y gwnaeth Maxen Lydaw yn eil Frytaen, ac a rodes hi y Gynan Meiriadawc.' Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, i. 10; Giraldus Cambrensis, *Itinerarium Cambriae*, *Works*, vol. vi, p. 166.

[2] *Vita Gildae*, c. 15 'in Armoricam quondam Galliae regionem tunc autem a Britannis, a quibus possidebatur, Letavia dicebatur.'

army serving in Britain, the army which never returned.[1] Then came, by the inroads of 'the Scots (i.e. the Irish) from the north-west, and the Picts from the north', years of agonized, bewildered suffering (*multos stupet gemitque annos*).

4. It is possible that these many years, when the wild northern marauders sped everywhere, saw the first beginnings of a migration to Armorica. The earliest cause of that migration is to be sought in these ravages, not in the Saxon invasion.

In 461 an informal Council was held at Tours by nine bishops, who had met in that city to celebrate the feast of St. Martin, November 11.[2] Their letter, dated the 18th of that month, is addressed to the other bishops, and bears among the signatures that of Mansuetus, 'Bishop of the Britons' (*episcopus Britannorum*). It is always well, when possible, to do more than to look at a list of names. The Council, we observe again, was informal, and a very small one. This bishop could hardly have come to a council of nine all the way from Britain, because the island since 407–10, by the usurpation of the tyrant Constantine, and especially by the subsequent pressure of the barbarians on the west of Gaul, had been severed from the empire. It appears natural to regard these Britanni and their bishop as then settled somewhere within, or near, the province of Tours, i.e. in Armorica. The bare wording, with no explanation, seems to favour such a view. So also would the often quoted words of Sidonius Apollinarius. When Arvandus, who held the post of Praetorian Prefect of Gaul, was accused, in 469, of traitorous correspondence with the Visigothic king, the leading evidence against him was an intercepted letter, in which he urged the latter to attack 'the Britanni who were settled upon the Loire', and were also allies of the empire.[3]

[1] *De Excidio Britanniae*, c. 14 'Exin Britannia omni armato milite, militaribus copiis, rectoribus licet immanibus, ingenti iuventute spoliata, quae comitata vestigiis supradicti tyranni domum nusquam ultra rediit.' This means that the Roman contingent never returned to the garrison towns of Britain.

[2] Migne, tome 54.

[3] Sidon. Apoll., *Ep.* i. 7, gives an account of the trial, with quotations

These Britons are thus spoken of as a well-known nation, and the river Loire, near the southern boundary of Brittany, as the place of their abode on the seacoast. In the same way, a little later, probably in the same year, as we know from Jordan's *History of the Gothic War*, 'Euric, King of the Visigoths, perceiving the frequent changes of Roman emperors, attempted to possess Gaul in his own right, and when Anthemius the emperor knew of this, he sought the assistance of the Britons. Their king, Riotimus, after disembarking from the ships he had on the sea, came to Bourges with 12,000 men and supported him. But against these, Euric, King of the Visigoths, advanced a large army, and after a hard fight against Riotimus, King of the Britons, before the Romans had joined their forces, put him to flight.' [1]

The simplest explanation of this paragraph seems to be that Riotimus used the ships which he had on the sea, for trade or transport, to sail up the river Loire, perhaps as far as Tours, whence, after disembarkation, he advanced to Bourges to meet his sad fate.

The conclusions reached so far in these pages may be summed up as follows:—First, the forces which accompanied Maximus, or Maxen Wledig, as the mediaeval British writers call him, had no relations whatever with the British people in Armorica; secondly, probably owing to Pictish and Irish (not Saxon) incursions which, at intervals, continued for more than half a century, a fairly numerous population of Britons had crossed to Armorica before the attacks of the Saxons and Angles assumed any large dimensions.

from the incriminating letter; among these are the words mentioned above: *Britannos super Ligerim sitos impugnari oportere.*

[1] *Iordanis Getica*, edited by Mommsen, pp. 118, 119 (Auctorum Antiquissimorum, tom. v), 'Euricus ergo, Visegotharum rex, crebram mutationem Romanorum principum cernens Gallias suo iure nisus est occupare. quod comperiens Anthemius imperator Brittonum solacia postulavit. quorum rex Riotimus cum duodecim milia veniens in Biturigas civitate oceano e navibus aggresso susceptus est. ad quos rex Visegotharum Eurichus innumerum ductans advenit exercitum diuque pugnans Riotimum Brittonum regem, antequam Romani in eius societate coniungerentur, effugavit.'

5. When we turn to the consideration of another view, viz. that the migration to Brittany followed, and was at the outset caused by, the Saxon invasion, several points need to be borne in mind. There is a question of dates. If Plummer's *Two Saxon Chronicles* is taken as a guide for the approximate dates, we learn that the final conquest of Kent was attained in 473; that the South Saxons were fighting against the Britons from 477 to 491; that the West Saxons, arriving about 491, carried on their warfare to 544 or later. The dates, however, mentioned above are anterior to all these. Before Bernicia was invaded (547), Gildas had written his book, and thirty years later the Battle of Deorham was fought, which separated the territory of the North Welsh, i.e. the Wales of the present day, from the Welsh of Devon and Cornwall, giving Bath, Cirencester, Gloucester, and other places to the English. The whole Severn Valley was opened to them, possibly from Viriconium. We have thus travelled from 473 to 577, about a century of time. The men, moreover, who migrated to Armorica, carrying with them the names Cornubia, Dumnonia, and Demetia, did not come from any of the parts successively conquered at these times by the English and Saxons; we may except the West Saxons, but the emigrants came from the West Wealas—the West Welsh—of Devon and Cornwall, from South Wales, some also from North Wales. Ireland, even, gave to the new Britannia its St. Ronan and others. The Saxon invasion, it must be inferred, could not be the main cause, certainly not the only cause, of the great tide of emigration which from these parts so extensively spread over, and left permanent marks on, this westernmost corner of Gaul. Gildas, in telling his story of the miseries which (as he regarded the course of events) the strict vengeance of Heaven had inflicted upon the Britons, writes as follows: 'Some of the wretched remnant were consequently captured on the mountains and killed in heaps. Others, overcome by hunger, came and yielded themselves to the enemies, to be their slaves for ever, if they were not instantly slain, which was equivalent to the greatest service. Others repaired to parts beyond the sea, with strong lamentation, as if, instead

of the oarsman's call, singing thus beneath the swelling sails:

> Thou hast given us like sheep appointed for eating,
> And among the gentiles hast thou scattered us.' [1]

In an earlier chapter, describing what he intends to write, he says: 'I shall do it, however, to the best of my ability, not so much by the aid of native writings or records of authors, inasmuch as these (if they ever existed) have been burnt by the fires of enemies, or carried far away in the ships which exiled my countrymen, and so are not at hand.' [2]

Brittany is not named in either of these quotations, yet it can hardly be doubted that these exiles of his people, deported to foreign lands, or in flight from servitude or slaughter, with the Psalmist's plaintive verses as their song, were contingents of the crowds which, before the time of writing, and still more numerously later, sought a home in the new Britannia. These fugitives from the Saxons sailed to Armorica *because countrymen of their own were there already*, and fell in with others who were beginning to turn thither impelled by motives of another kind. It is probable that Gildas, in the words quoted, is describing in particular the consequences of the fierce conflict between the West Saxons and the Britons during its later stages. He may have been acquainted with eyewitnesses of the exile, or even with men who shared in it. He, at any rate, is writing his book in Britain, with a deep longing for the holy quiet of the hermit life, and it may be that he was himself eventually drawn to Brittany owing to representations made by some such men of the exile.

[1] Gildas, *De Excidio Brit.* c. 25 'Alii transmarinas petebant regiones cum ululatu magno ceu celeumatis vice hoc modo sub velorum sinibus cantantes:

> Dedisti nos tamquam oves escarum,
> et in gentibus dispersisti nos.' Ps. xliii. (xliv.) 12.

[2] Ibid., c. 4 'Quantum tamen potuero non tam ex scriptis patriae scriptorumve monimentis, quippe quae, vel si qua fuerint, aut ignibus hostium exusta aut civium exilii classe longius deportata non compareant.'

We have further to consider the view taken by early Breton writers themselves. Of these the most distinct perhaps is the biographer of Winwalocus, who, though writing in the ninth century, used traditions preserved for him in the monastery of Landevennoc reaching back to a far earlier time. According to him, the exodus was caused by the Saxon invasion. 'They (the people of Britain) were carried over,' he says, 'to this side of the sea, into the land of Britannia, at no other time than when the barbarous and warlike nation of the Saxons took possession of their native soil. From that time the beloved race has found itself in this asylum, where it is established, after so many toils, undisturbed by war.' [1] All Breton legends concur in this—that Brittany was formed by migration.

We have found thus far two causes of the migration of British people to a corner of France. They fled, in the first place, from the severities committed by the ravaging hordes of the northern barbarians, before, and even after, the first of the Saxons came to Britain. In the second place, after the stubborn wars waged against the West Saxons, came defeat and loss of territory, which drove many to seek an asylum across the sea in a land where some of their countrymen had already settled.

6. I am led to believe that there were at least two contributory causes at work, which ought to be mentioned. (*a*) One of these is 'the great plague'. There is a passage in the *Life of Teilo*, wherein, though marked by several features that are unmistakably legendary, we read what may, nevertheless, be regarded as reminiscent of a real fact. The saint is

[1] Loth, *L'Emigr. br. en Armorique*, p. 168, quoted from a MS. in the Bibliothèque Nat.

From Procopius of Caesarea (died 565), a Greek author who wrote *The Wars of the Goths* (De Bello Gothico), one passage has often been cited, iv. 20, as containing a reference to Brittany and the emigrations to it at this time. Two facts may be culled out of his narrative, confused and inexplicable as it is in detail. 1. The migrations were many and successive—*ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος*—'every year.' 2. The land was in great part a desert—*τὴν ἐρημοτέραν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι*. The extracts from Procopius may be read in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica* of Petrie, pp. lxxxiii–lxxxiv.

directed by an angel to dwell for a time in Brittany. A fierce pestilence was in the land, the dying and the dead were many. Maelgwn, King of Gwynedd, was one of the victims: 'Maelgwn, King of Gwynedd,' the Life says, 'was carried away and the land was made bare'. Teilo, as directed by the angel, crossed the sea and came to Cornubia (*Cornubiensis regio*), with a host of his people, lay and cleric, men and women.[1] He renewed his old comradeship with Samson, remembering the years they had spent together under St. Dubricius. When, however, he returned home, many remained behind to rear fresh 'lanns' and churches, finding in the new Britannia, ecclesiastically, a land of greater freedom and pleasanter environment.

(*b*) We have mentioned a second contributory cause. Those who make the Saxon invasion the chief, almost the sole cause, of this migration, leave out of sight the influence which monachism itself wielded. The ascetic's yearning for fuller sacrifice, for the abandonment of *all* things, led in Britain and Ireland to the ideal of a pilgrimage 'for God's sake'. There was, as has been said by some one, 'a witchery' about these Celtic leaders, which drew men to them, and exercised powerful personal influence over minds and hearts, not simply in private intercourse, but also in the shaping and directing of public life. These who ventured the great sacrifice, and found its spiritual calm, drew many like-minded men to them.

There was an opening for the freer play of such motives (as described in the *Vitae*) in a new country, and these tended to intensify this influence in visible form. Motives —deeply felt motives we may say—cannot be excluded, nor ought they to be forgotten, in any enumeration of the series of operative causes. This flight across the seas had a religious motive. The Life of St. Samson, for instance, shows the working of a conviction that a monk is bound to relinquish all that is dear to him—father, mother, country—in order to be a pilgrim on earth. St. Samson's uncle, Umbraphel, and his wife, had been persuaded by him to

[1] *Book of Llandâv*, p. 131. *Cornubia*, in the Life of Ordoceus, is *Cornugallia*.

become monk and nun, just as Samson's own father and mother had been similarly persuaded. On the saint's return from Ireland, he addressed his uncle : 'Thou, brother Umbraphel, ought to be a pilgrim (*peregrinus esse debes*).' Consequently, with this new impulse, Umbraphel departs for Ireland, Samson himself turning his face to Brittany, and settling there at Dol, in the new Cornubia or Cernyw. He went, it is said, *patriam et parentes pro Dei amore relinquens.* M. Loth remarks how monastic companionship or ecclesiastical brotherhood is conspicuous in the successive arrivals of different bands of pilgrims *pro Christo salvatore.* 'The emigrating saints were, usually, accompanied by numerous followers, and M. de la Borderie has found it possible to lay down the rule, that with every saint from the island of Britain a host of emigrants reached the shores of the peninsula. Ninocea, the daughter of Brychan, King of Cambria, and a relative of Gwrtheyrn, came to Armorica with four bishops, a great number of presbyters, of deacons, of religious (monks), and persons of every condition.' The same remark may be made of Samson, of Paul Aurelian, of Tutwal : 'With him came his mother, his sister and seventy-two hermits. Hagiographic writers give to Leonarius seventy-three disciples, to Brioc sixty-eight,' &c.

To sum up, among the causes of the migration may be reckoned the sufferings due to the depredations of the Picts and Scots, the wars of the West Saxons, the ravages of the great pestilence. And with these must be counted, too, the influence exercised by religious motives, such as the desire for greater freedom than was possible in the older Church of the insular Britain, and the enthusiastic zeal which existed, imperfect though its ideal probably was, for the conversion of unbelievers.

The peninsula of Armorica is represented, not only as a desert, but also as heathen, though in Gallo-Roman times a number of important churches stood in its immediate neighbourhood, such as Tours, Rennes, le Mans, Angers, Nantes, and the civitates of the Coriosopites (Quimper), and Osismori,[1] afterwards Leon, where the Briton, Paul Aurelian,

[1] See the account of Duchesne, 'Les diocèses aux temps romains,' in *Fastes épiscopaux de l'ancienne Gaule*, ii, p. 241.

came in the sixth century, and to which he also gave his name. Those who went as pilgrims also obeyed the calling to be missionaries for the conversion of the heathen or the renewal of the Christianity, living but languishing, which still survived in their new home. St. Briocus, whose *Vita* represents him as the companion, at Auxerre, of St. Illtud and St. Patrick, is said to have been falling asleep on the night of Pentecost, after the labours of the divine services, when the angel of the Lord appeared to him. The angel's message was as follows: 'Thou, O holy man, must take up the toil of pilgrimage, crossing the sea to Latium, 'so that thou mayest show forth to others also the rites of holy religion and the example of a good life.'[1] Other instances of such a mission are easy to find.

We have before us a fact of no small moment. Britain, the home land, was a Christian country; the emigrants were Christians, who carried oversea their institutions of Church and monastery together with their faith. In this respect the colonization of Brittany was unlike any known to us in the early centuries. The land, as the *Vitae* testify, was a desert, made desert by the Empire itself, owing to many years of crushing imperial taxation extorted by selfish officials, and because of the ravages of barbarian hordes. Dense forests reached even to the sea, among the few clear spaces of which a sparse population fed their hogs. Armorica was a land for emigrants. Until about the middle of the sixth century, these settlers were mostly the monks; abbots were followed by members of their *côr* or *lan*, and by clerics, but with them also came numerous friends, the laity or *plebs*. For these monks manual labour, such as they had practised in the monasteries of Britain, was part of their discipline, and, after immense labour on their part with the assistance of their associates, there arose the *plebem* or *plou*, our *plwy*. This term originally denoted the people as *forming the ecclesiastical community*, ὁ λαός as the Greeks termed it, but afterwards the district from which they were

[1] *Vita S. Brioci*, *Anal. Bollandiana*, p. 177. *Latium*, if not for Lettau (Letavia), must mean a Roman land where Latin was spoken: 'ut et aliis sacrae religionis ritum et bonae conversationis ostendas exemplum.'

drawn. *Laicus*, which has given us *leyg*, is not so common as *plebs, plebem.*

Huts, of wood or rough stone, were built for the individual members of the emigrating band, then a wooden chapel and a refectory. As in Britain, such a place was called *lanna*, the *lan* of him who as *Abad* was leader of the community. The people who accompanied the ascetics formed with them the *plou*, sometimes a large host of settlers. Thus the *Vita S. Pauli Aureliani* says of the site selected by him that 'the place is that which is now called the monastery of Paul, or in the common language *Lanna Pauli* in plebe Telmedoviae'.[1] We note the significant remark that *Lanna Pauli*, as it is named to-day, was the name given to the monastery by the people 'in their own tongue', just as the monastery of Illtud in South-west Britain from whence Paul had come was named, 'in the common language, Llanilltud.' It was situated *in plebe*, among the people (*plebs*), or congregation of, Telmedovia, though, by the time of the writer of the Chartulary, the Britonized form *plou* had taken a civic or territorial signification. At first it was not so. *Plwyf* or *plwy* must have been a term in use in Britain before the emigration, in the sense of a congregation, or lay members of a church community. It occurs in this sense even as late as the Welsh Life of St. David, in the anecdote about Gildas's inability to preach because the nun (*lleian*), who became the mother of David, was present in church. The writer says that Gildas asked all to go out. He was, however, still powerless to preach, because the nun had hidden herself behind the door. Gildas directed her also to go out and bid the congregation return. Now his powers of preaching 'clear and loud' are restored, but the congregation is curious, and would learn of him the reason of his previous failure. 'Ac arch ir *plwyf* dynot ymywn . . . ac yna pregethu a oruc y sant yn eglur ac yn uchel. Yna y gouynnawd y *plwyf* idaw, paham na elleisti pregethu yni gynheu.' Here the Latin *Vita* has *plebs*, and *plwyf*, derived from the accusative case *pleb-em*, evidently means congregation.

[1] *Anal. Bolland.* i, p. 238.

In the Welsh Laws *plwyf Teilo* means the Church or Cathedral Church, the diocese, of Teilo. Many other instances could be adduced; it only remains to add that now *plwy*, as *plou* in Brittany, has only a territorial signification. I am obliged to differ here from M. de la Borderie, who holds that, while *lan* was used as an ecclesiastical term, *plou* had a civic, or secular, signification for the organized community. Both terms were, as I understand them, originally ecclesiastical. Though *lan* belonged to the monastery rather than to the church, *plou* or *plwy* was purely ecclesiastical. With us *Lanna* has ceased to have a monastic application, though in Brittany itretains it.

Whether we follow the map at the end of de la Borderie's *Histoire de Bretagne*, vol. i, or the fine French Ordnance Maps published in Departments, the beginning of a brief survey may be made at Dol. We are guided for the most part by the different Lives, many, or rather most, of which were written in the ninth century and after, though based in some cases on a tradition considerably older. In details it is sometimes difficult or impossible to ascertain what is historical, yet there remains a consistent substratum and real kernel of truth provided the student does not demand absolute exactitude, but is content with somewhat hazy borders. This northern part of Brittany took the name of Dumnonia, the name of the British territory whence the earliest settlers came. Outside Britain, Samson is the widest known of these men of the sixth century; born in Demetia, now Pembroke, his father a man of Dyfed, his mother a woman of Gwent, he became a disciple of Illtud at Llanilltud, where he was, it is said, ordained bishop by Dubricius. He may have migrated to Dol some time about the middle of the century. Here he built a monastery, and another at Pental, and was recognized as bishop (or even archbishop, though this designation is considerably later) at Dol. Not far off is Lan Sulian (Suliens), who in the *Vita* (late and confused) is represented as the son of a British prince of the name of Brochmael; in early years, and against his father's will, he had entered a monastery situated in 'a great city called Meibot', but afterwards joined in the

migration. In the case of Lan Aleth the facts are clearer and more certain. Hither St. Malo, that is Maclovius, who was born in Gwent, sailed to build a monastic establishment some time after Samson had settled at Dol, which also is described as the centre of a wide and successful missionary work, leading, as was the fashion of the time and country, to the founding of other *lans* or monasteries. According to one account he also was ordained bishop in Britain, living and working in the south-western parts of Wales. Another detailed story tells of his consecration at Tours after long years of apostolic labours at Lan Aleth.[1]

At a moderate distance from Lan Aleth, Leonorius or Lunarius, another British bishop, born, as is said, and ordained bishop in Britain (*episcopus Brito, natus et consecratus in Wallia, tempore Commorri*, as Lobineau says), betook himself to the solitude of those districts with similar results. Further west, in the Département des Côtes-du-Nord, we find Tréguier, a place connected, probably, with very early settlements. The old name is Trechor or Trecor, and a reference to another page will show how this word *côr* is found also in 'Bangor'. Over all Dumnonia, the founder, Tudwal, was revered as saint and apostle. His first *lan* was built at Lan Pabu (Pabu being a name specially given by the Bretons to Tudwal, signifying father), but afterwards he moved further east to Trecor, at the invitation of his cousin Deroch, who was prince of those parts, or as the Life says, King of Dumnonia.[2] We have no

[1] *Deux vies inédites de S. Malo*, by Plaine and de la Borderie; the strictures of Duchesne in *Revue Celtique*, tome xi, 1890, p. 20, should also be read, St. Malo being strangely connected with the romantic voyages of St. Brenden in his search for the Fortunate Isles. The earliest *Vita* is by Bili, one of his successors at Lan Aleth.

[2] Deroch's father was Riwal, 'first King of Dumnonia', and brother of Tudwal's mother, who has also been very strangely identified with Conan Meriadoc (Cynan Meiriadog). Riwal seems to be about the first British chief that settled in Armorica; his sister apparently followed her son. There are three Lives of Tudwal, in which the form of the name varies—Tutgualus, Tudual, Tudual, Tual. The island off Pwllheli in Lleyn is called in the common speech of people in those parts, *Studwal*, which probably stands, according to ancient British usage, not for St. Tudwal, but for 's Tydwal, *s* being the last consonant of *ynys*, and, therefore, the full name is Ynys Tudwal.

account respecting the place from which Tudwal came; whether the name of the island, *'s Tudwal*, betokens a North Wales origin, it is difficult, if not impossible, to tell. He seems to have migrated as a monk and bishop to Trecor, where an important monastery rose, of which he was abbot.

Further west, in the Pagus Leonensis, settled Paulus Aurielanus, who was born in Glamorgan at Pen Ychen, or, as the Breton biographer pronounced the name, Pen Ochen.[1] Paulus was a disciple of Illtud, but seems to have migrated early. He spent some time on the island of Ushant, i.e. Ouessant (Enes Huessa, or Huessa sant), having built a small oratory there, and in it a stone altar, with huts for the use of himself and his fourteen companions, whose names are preserved by Wrmonoc.[2] This place to-day bears the name Lampaul. But by an angel's command he moved on to the mainland, where, with the help of Withur, a British prince and relative, the permanent Lampaul was founded, the home of his further strenuous apostolic life as abbot, and afterwards as bishop. Many *lanns* were founded from this centre, and from the old Roman fortress of Castell Paol, the present Saint-Pol de Leon.

Moreover, from the same Pen Ychen (or Pen Ochen) in Glamorgan, there went to the new country a number of monks, headed by an abbot, named Arthmael, whose piety is highly praised. He landed, so Albert le Grand says, on the coast of Leon at an estuary called Aber Benniguet, but proceeded south to found Plou Arzel, near Saint-Renan, Finistère.[3]

Landevennec and its Chartulary have been mentioned already, but the main part of the Chartulary consists of a Life of the founder, Winwaloeus, or, as he is called in French, Guenolé.[4] This work was put together at Landevennec by

[1] The *Vita* reads Pen Ohen, but *h* often stands for *ch*.

[2] *Vita*, in *Anal. Boll.*, tom. i, p. 234.

[3] In Breton, Arthmael is Arzel; in French, Armel. The abbot crossed with a band of emigrants under Caroncinalis or Carenkinal, as French writers call him, a British chief and cousin of Paul Aurelian. See Albert le Grand, *Les Vies des Saints de Bret.*, p. 383, ed. 1901.

[4] *Vita S. Winwaloei*, edited in *Anal. Bollandiana*, vii, pp. 167-249, by Carolus de Smedt. Winualoeus is another form of the name.

Urdisten (Urdestinus Monachus), in the ninth century, and contains much that is of real historical value. He had at his service materials preserved in the monastery reaching back to the sixth century. We gather from the early chapters that this foundation by Guenolé is regarded by the writers as the first British monastery in Armorica. He was the first monk whose natural abilities and character were such as to allow of his taking an active part in public life.

EXCURSUS D

British Hagiographic Literature

Vitae Sanctorum—Lives of Saints—Bucheddau y Saint

The sources for our history now become fuller and more distinctively British or Irish. Under *British* we include the literature that has come to us from the *Britannia* of Armorica. There had been *Acta* from of old; speaking generally, it may be said that of Acta or Passiones, which record the heavenly walk of saints and their sufferings, the majority are the result of the persecutions. Not a few of these Acts are regarded as genuine in their narration of events which were almost, if not entirely, contemporary. They range from the earliest—The Martyrdom of Polycarp—including the Acta of Justin Martyr, the Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas, the Acta of Cyprian and others, to the Acta of the 'Forty Martyrs of Sebaste', in number about thirty to thirty-five.[1]

This class of literature, though in process of time degenerating into stories in which true feeling and simplicity of character are lost, became popular. The Acts of the Saints were read in the churches, hymns without number were

[1] The number will differ according to the views of genuineness held by critics. We may compare Bardenhewer's account in his *Geschichte d. altchristl. Literatur* with that of Harnack.

sung in their honour, and discourses upon them delivered with a view to edification and exhortation.[1]

It is well known that the day on which the martyr was believed to have suffered was called his 'birthday', his *natalicium*. The natal day of the Lord Himself is called *Natalic Crist* in the British language, while modern Welsh has made it into *Nadolig Crist*. But what we are concerned to consider is that, as the ascetics from St. Antonius and St. Paul of Thebes onwards, with their countless followers, took the same position as the martyrs in so far as they were regarded as saints, so also a vast body of similarly edificatory literature grew up around their names. The day of the death of a hermit or monk was held to be his *natalicium*, since it was his glorious birth to the Kingdom on high, and on its anniversary his Life was read in the churches, as the Passion of the martyr had long been. The extended connotation of the term *Saint* soon became general, and produced this vast innovation in Christian literature. In early and, where the monastic narratives are nearly contemporary with the events they depict, even in late documents, we have sources which are, for the most part, of reliable historical value. Yet there are scarcely any in which the unhistorical has not been interwoven with the historical. The *Life of St. Martin* by Sulpicius Severus, that of Honoratus by Hilary of Arles, somewhat later, the *Life of Garmon* by Constantius, belong to the fifth century. The first two are the work of the saints' disciples, yet all reveal the same tendency to exalt the sanctity and devotion, aye, and the miraculous powers, of the men whose biographies they purport to be. To the same class belong the *Life of Columbanus* by Jonas, Adamnan's *Life of Columba*, the writings of Muirchu and Tirechan, and the *Life of Cuthbert* by the Venerable Beda.

It may be remarked that there lies at the basis of the worst kind of hagiography an utter absence of any idea of progress, or of the changes necessary for the realization of it. The spiritual life of the Middle Ages is sunk in unmoving legend. Prejudiced in favour of his own ideal of what a 'saint' ought to be, the writer of a Life often revels in the creation of incidents and circumstances, the absurdity of which is at times disheartening to read. Some is true, more is fictitious, the whole is conventional, and so

[1] The Sermons of Augustine contain frequent references to this reading, as well as instances of the discourses, or of allusions to the content of what had been read.

subjectively coloured in the writer's mind that it becomes transformed into a romance.[1]

Such a Life was written sometimes with older documents, an older *Vita* occasionally, to serve as basis, but too frequently it is a *résumé* of local tradition as it floated about from mouth to mouth among a credulous people. Hence arose the bad nuance of the word 'legend'. The practice of reading the Lives, the *Vitae Patrum*, on the festivals of saints spread far and wide, while it reached the climax of its popularity about the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.[2] But in the succeeding centuries the conviction gradually arose that there were masses of detailed narrative in them that were purely arbitrary and apocryphal. *Legenda* in England thus became the equivalent of myth; in Wales, however, *legenda*, assuming the form *legen*, *leen*, *len*, or *llen*, has appropriated the better meaning of literature or erudition.

Our Lives of David, Dubricius, Teilo, Oudoceus, and others are, in reality, sermons—*legendae* or *lectiones*—of this type, drawn up for both liturgic and private use. This essentially homiletic character of so-called Lives (*Vitae*), which tempts the writer into excessive laudation, should not be forgotten by the reader when he peruses them.

The following account of the literature which serves to illustrate the side, or the part of the life of the Church with which we are at present concerned, may prove useful. But we first enumerate the names to which attention is the more especially drawn in these records.

1. Dubricius, in British Dyfrig, monk and bishop.
2. Illtud, Iltutus, founder of Llanilltud on Caldy Island.
3. Samson, migrated, as consecrated bishop, to Dol.

[1] The study of the growth of such legendary biographies is a study of the ways of thought at different times and of the workings of Christian motives. It should commend itself to us as deserving serious notice. The present writer has endeavoured to set aside his prejudices, frequently the result of ignorance, against what have been called 'monkish tales'. The well-known Bollandist editor, Père Delehaye, has reprinted in book form several contributions made by him to the *Revue des Questions historiques* (1903), where a sober and scientific treatment of the strange growth of hagiographic legends may be found. He gives us matter for thought when we read some curious parts of the Lives of our Dewi and Teilo, of Beuno and Winefred. I am referring to a small unpretentious volume, *Les Légendes hagiographiques*, par Hippolyte Delehaye, 1906. An English translation also has appeared.

[2] 'Legendarius vocatur liber ille, ubi agitur de vita et obitu confessorum, qui legitur in eorum festis, martyrum autem in passionariis,' Migne, *P. L.* 202, 66. Du Cange confirms this.

4. Gildas in Pembroke, Ireland, Britain, Brittany. Author of *De Excidio Britanniae.*

5. David at Kilmuine, Kil-Mynyw or Ty Ddewi, as abbot and bishop.

6. Paul Aurelian, disciple of Illtud ; migrated early.

7. Teilo, also called Eliud, first Bishop of Llandâv, and abbot of its *llan.*

8. Oudoceus, second Bishop of Llandâv.

9. Cadoc, Abbot of Llancarvan, also called Catmail, Cathmael.

10. Kentigern (Cyndeyrn), Bishop of Glasgow, founder of Llanelwy monastery and church.

11. Asaph, disciple of Kentigern and his successor as abbot and bishop.

12. Cybi (Kebius), a wandering saint.

13. Padarn (Paternus), abbot and bishop in Ceredigion.

14. Pedrog (Petrocius).

15. Finian or Finan (Finianus, Vinnians), founder and Abbot of Clonard in Ireland, disciple of David and Gildas at Kilmuine.

16. Comgall, founder and Abbot of Bangor on Belfast Lough, disciple of David and Gildas.

17. Caranog (Carantocus).

18. Brynach.

19. Gwynlliw (Gundleius).

20. Aiduus, also called Maedocus, Madawc, disciple of St. David. Migrated to Ireland.

21. Brendan ; an Irish saint of many adventures ; visited Gildas.

22. Beuno.

I. We may now notice first those *Vitae* which are possibly of Breton origin. Some were written very early in the seventh century, soon after A.D. 600. The rough materials used by others may be of the same age. They appear to have come from the Benedictine monastery of Fleury (Floriacum).

1. Life of Samson, *Vita S. Samsonis.* This Life was printed first in Mabillon's *Acta Sanctorum*, Ord. S. Bened. Saec. i, and then in the Bollandists' *Acta Sanctorum*, Iulii vi, 573–81. Another form of the Life has been published by Dom Plaine in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. vi, and is found in several MSS. These two might be called *Vita I* and *Vita II*; the former purports to be written by a monk of Dol, who received his information from 'an ancient man, who had led the catholic and religious life for nearly eighty years within the walls of a monastery founded by St. Samson' in Britain.

His account was related to him (the aged monk) by his uncle, the deacon Enoch, who had lived with Samson and knew the Saint's mother. The substance of *Vita I* may, therefore, be dated about A.D. 600–15. So de la Borderie says in his *Histoire de Bretagne*, vol. i, p. 560. Since the first appearance of that volume, however, further investigations into the relations of the MSS. of *Vita II* have fixed its composition to about 900.

2. Life of Paul Aurelian, Paulus Aurelianus, or Pol de Leon. See *Aa. Ss.* Mart. ii, pp. 111–19. Another *Vita* is published by Dom Plaine in *Analecta Bollandiana*, tom. i; and the same from another MS. by M. Ch. Cuissard in the *Revue Celtique*, v. 417.

3. Life of Gildas. There are two Lives of Gildas. *Vita I* was written by the monk, as he is generally called, of Ruis, a monastery in Brittany founded by Gildas; it is, however, a redaction by him of an older Life, the materials of which have much in common with the Life of Paul Aurelian. The other—*Vita II*—is the work of Caradoc of Llancarvan, written probably four or five centuries later than the former. Both are printed in the Cymmrodorion edition of Gildas.

4. Life of Briocus. This *Vita* is published in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, tom. ii. He is also called Briomaglus, and is represented as a contemporary of Patrick and Illtud.

5. Life of Maclovius, also called Machutus, now St. Malo. There are six *Vitae* of Maclovius; the best is not easily accessible, though it is published separately by Plaine and de la Borderie, *Deux vies inédites de S. Malo* (1884). Extracts may be found in Leland's *Collectanea* and Wh. Stokes's *Lives of Saints from the Book of Lismore* (1890).

St. Malo is interesting as an abbot of Gwent (Monmouth), who crossed to Armorica about the same time as Gildas, though a considerably younger man. See also Pertz, *Monum. Scr. Germ.* vii, p. 505.

6. Winwaloeus, or Uinualoeus, in French writers Guenolé. The *Vita S. Winwaeloei* is edited with full Introduction in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vii, pp. 117–249. The editor is of opinion that cc. 1–15 formed a series of Lessons read on the Saint's festival; in cc. 19, 20, St. Patrick is represented as being alive and appearing in a vision to Winwaloeus. There is also mention of Tudwal:—

> Eximius isto Tutualus nomine clarus,
> Cum meritis monachus multorum exemplar habendus.

The writer was intimate with Gildas's work, and in some

places imitated his style. Besides Gildas's work, he evidently had also early written materials to work upon.

7. Melanius, *Acta Sanctorum* of the Bollandists, Jan., tom. i, p. 327. His name is probably preserved for us in the British *Myllin*, now found in the name Llanfyllin, a parish and town in Montgomeryshire. In Brittany it was Melaine.

II. The Book of Llandâv, or *Liber Landavensis*, a Chartulary of the church of Llandâv. I use Gwenogfryn Evans's edition, 1893. This work cannot be earlier than A.D. 1107, because it breaks off with the consecration of Urban to be Bishop of Llandav at that date. With the year 1126 begin insertions of documents respecting acute troubles which the same Urban experienced as against Robert of Gloucester and the two Bishops of St. Davids (*Sanctus Dewi*) and Hereford (pp. 27–67). The two Popes whose letters appear in this part are Honorius II (1124–30) and Innocent II (1130–43). John, the cardinal legate of the former, it is interesting to read, confirms an indulgence (*indulgentia*) for the building of Llandâv, where he found 'the church oppressed by poverty, robbed of its goods and possessions'. 'We pray you all,' the *exhortatio* says to the faithful, 'and confer upon you remission of your sins, that ye may be willing to help and sustain the place by your gifts and alms. We have also received you to the favour (*beneficium*) and the prayers of our mother the Roman Church.'

On p. 26 there are extracts from the *Liber Pontificalis* respecting 'Lucius Britannicus rex', and from Beda, i. 6, 7, about the ten-year persecution and the martyrdom of Albanus, Aaron and Julius. It may be noted that while Beda, following Gildas, mentions Aaron and Julius as 'citizens of *Legionum Urbs*, and the others who suffered in *different* places', the compiler of this work says that they, 'and a host of martyrs, suffered *at Civitas Legionum on Usk*' (*cum martirum copia apud Civitatem Legionum supra Huisc sitam*). The editor gives 1150 as the date of the Chartulary; for reasons stated in these pages I am unable to follow him in the opinion that it is the work of Geoffrey of Monmouth, who was then archdeacon at Llandâv. It may reasonably be placed during the ten years 1140–50.

Several Lives have been included in the volume.

1. Life of Samson, a summary of the older *Vita* published by Mabillon. (2) *Lectiones*, i.e. Readings or *Lectiones* from the Life of Dubricius; these may be much older than the work itself. (3) Life of Teilo. (4) Life of Oudoceus: the last two must be by the same author, who is also, I

infer, the writer of the Life of Dubricius, though not of the *Lectiones* in substance. I am strongly inclined to believe that the three came from the pen of the compiler himself, and so belong, in their present shape, to the time named, about A. D. 1140–50.

2. There are two short stories embedded in the body of the *Book of Llandâv*. The first is that of the brave King Teudiric, who had transferred his kingdom to his son Mouricus (Meiryg) in order to lead a hermit's life near Tintern ("in rupibus Dindyrn"). His quiet is broken upon by the news that the Saxons were attacking his son's territory, and he is directed by an angel to sally forth in aid of his people against these 'enemies of the Church'. After his triumph, this redoubtable 'man of God' (*vir Dei*), returned to die in peace from the wound inflicted upon him at Ryt Tindyrn, as the angel had foretold.[1] A tradition of West Saxon incursions is here, probably, preserved. The other story is that of King Clitawe, son of Clitguin, in Morganwg, noted for his peaceful life and rigorous justice. This young king was basely slain by an underling, but after his burial is testified to have been exalted to the ranks of martyrs. God and men join in this testimony to one who was saint without being monk.[2]

III. *Cambro-British Saints*, edited in 1858 by the Rev. W. I. Rees, M.A. A fresh edition of these Lives is sorely needed notwithstanding the collations that have been made and published; the translations are extremely untrustworthy and misleading. The volume contains—

1. Life of Brynach, *Vita S. Bernaci*, from the MS. Vespasian A. XIV, British Museum.

2. A British, or Welsh, Life of Beuno from a MS. 'in the possession of the Earl of Macclesfield, compared with another in the Library of Jesus College, Oxford'. This contains the story of Gwenvrevi (St. Winefred) and the building of Kelynnauc (Clynnog). It has, however, been published in a far more perfect form in *Llyvyr Ankyr Llanddewivrevi*, edited by Prof. J. Morris Jones. It appears to be a Welsh sermon.

3. Life of Cadog or Cattwg, *Vita S. Catoci*, from the British Museum MS. Vesp. A. XIV, p. 17, collated with Titus D. XXII, p. 51. This Life is also in parts a Chartulary of Llancarvan, c. 63 agreeing with p. 176 of the *Book of Llandâv*, Sulgen, Abbot of Llancarvan, and Saturn, Abbot of Docguinni.

[1] *Book of Llandâv*, p. 143.

[2] Ibid., p. 193; also in *Acta Sanctorum*, Aug. iii, p. 733.

being named as witnesses in both; while the account of the Synod (*sinodus*) held in the case of Guidnerth, who had killed his brother Merchion, is given at length on pp. 180–3 (*B. of Ll.*) and the murder itself is mentioned in the chapter named of the *Vita*. The ridiculous and impossible pedigrees of c. 42 remind one of Geoffrey's *Historia*; all the Roman emperors stand as a line of fathers and sons! This biographer also has Maximianus for Maximus. Names of persons and places are somewhat modern in the *Vita*, e.g. Sulien for Sulgen, and the whole tenor of what is related betrays the marks of a writer influenced by mediaeval usages, and one too who must be later than Geoffrey. It is by far the fullest *Vita* in the volume, written in a style superior to any other; the quotations from Scripture are numerous and have interesting features. In the four verses which end c. 41, and close the *Vita* proper, the author seems to give his name—Cibrius; the last two lines are as follows:—

> Det veniam Christus, terrarum conditor orbis,
> Cui scripsit vitam culparum nomine *Lifris*.

4. Life of Carannog, *Vita S. Carantoci*, from Br. Mus. Vespasian A. XIV. Evidently a sermon for the Saint's day, the 16th of May. A pedigree traced back to Anna, the cousin (or sister) of the Virgin Mary, is given to Carannog, as to Catoc and David in their respective Lives.

5. Life of St. David: (*a*) *Vita S. David*, from Br. Mus. Vespasian A. XIV, collated with Nero E. I. This Life was written by Ricemarchus (Rychmarch),[1] who died Bishop of St. Davids in 1096–7, and to it all other records of Dewi Sant seem to go back. In *Brut y Tywysogion*, p. 273, he is spoken of as Rychmarch, 'the wisest of the wise among the British,' and his learning pronounced to be most widely acknowledged; his name being thus given, not Rygyfarch, still less the more usual Ryddmarch.

Another Latin *Vita* of St. David was written by Giraldus Cambrensis, but, though put together, as the earlier Life, at St. David's, it simply repeats the older, containing no new matter beyond a number of local points of detail and identification. We have over again what had been already set forth by Ricemarchus. In this fact a reminder is given that when Giraldus wrote, about A.D. 1208, no more was known at St. Davids itself, than we are in possession of at the present day.

[1] Another person, evidently called after him, but half a century later, is similarly Richmarch, p. 312; a somewhat older form of the name—Rigyfarch—is found on p. 226; he is not the biographer of Dewi Sant.

(*b*) A well-written Welsh Life also appears in this volume, printed from the Br. Mus. MS. Titus D. XXII; the same is also published and edited by Prof. J. Morris Jones, Bangor, in *Llyvyr Ankyr Llanddewivrevi*, 1346 (from the Jesus College MS. 119)—*Ystorion o Vuchedd Dewi.* This Welsh Life is not quite a version but a summary, much abbreviated in parts, yet with not a few significant additions and changes. It is evidently a sermon, and one that is worthy of appreciative reading.

6. Life of Gwynlliw, *Vita S. Gundleii*, from Br. Mus. MS. Vespasian A. XIV, collated with Titus D. XII. Very confused and of no value for us.

7. Life of Illtud, *Vita S. Iltuti.* The date of this Life may be placed somewhat late in the twelfth century, its agreement with the *Book of Llandâv* being frequently very evident. In c. 2 we find an incident related which occurred when 'William, King of the English, ruled over Britain and Robert Fitz Hamon governed Gwlad Morgan (*Gulatmorvantia*).' The writer with Lantwit Major or Llanilltud Fawr before his eyes, did not know the older Llanilltud, and is quite astray in his description of the noted *llan.*

8. Cybi, *Vita S. Kebii*, from Br. Mus. MS. Vespasian XIV. The anachronisms in this Life are astounding; after a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, a common detail of many Lives, Cybi was for some time with St. Hilary of Poitiers in the fourth century; then we find him harassed by Malgwn, 'King of Gwenidocia,' that enemy of the saints in the sixth century. He is consecrated bishop by Hilary, and visits Ireland. Nothing in the *Vita* connects him particularly with Caergybi (Holyhead), except his sailing from Ireland for *Mona Insula*, yet if he was, as others were, a wandering monk-bishop, this habit might account for Caergybi and the several Llangybi's that survive. The names of his disciples, Maelauc, Libiau, Peulan, Kengar, and Caffo, suggest a writer from, or acquainted with, Anglesey, where the five names are known to-day. This *Vita* again is a sermon.

9. Padarn, *Vita S. Paterni*, from Brit. Mus. Vespasian A. XIV (contained also in MS. Tib. E.). The very beginning proves that in this *Vita*, again, we have a sermon for the Saint's day. Padarn is made contemporary with David and Teilo: the three make a pilgrimage together to Jerusalem—an echo of real pilgrimages in the past—where they are ordained archbishops, and Britain was subsequently divided into 'three episcopates'. These correspond to three kingdoms: the kingdom of Rein (probably Demetia), where

St. David was bishop; the kingdom of Morgant, with St. Eliud (Teilo) as bishop; the third, *apud dextrales Brittanos*, is reserved as the *civitas sancti Paterni episcopi*, which must be in Ceredigion where he had built monasteries. 'Britain,' we observe, corresponds roughly to the present principality of Wales. And other writers use the name in the same way. The whole *Vita* is diffuse and confusing.

10. Gwenfrewi, *Vita S. Winefredae*, from Brit. Mus. Claudius A. V. There are here two parts: (*a*) *Vita*; (*b*) *Miracula*. The MS. bears an ascription added in the later transcription of the *Vita*, as being *per Elerium Britanum Monachum*, *an.* 660; *aut Robertum Salopiensem an.* 1190. This is a mere guess, and cannot be true. The Life written by Robert, Prior of Salop, is a different work; the two are contained in the Bollandist *Aa. Ss.* Nov. i, 702–8 and 702–31. In the one as well as the other we have a work of the twelfth century. The main story of the deed done by Caradoc in cutting off St. Winefred's head, and her miraculous restoration to life by Beuno, is told also in the *Buchedd Beuno* or *Hystoria o Vuched Beuno*, in *Llyvyr Ankyr*.

11. Life of Pedrog, *Vita S. Petroci*. A *Vita*, abridged from one mentioned by Leland, *Itiner.* viii. 52, is published in the *Nova Legenda Anglie*, written by John of Tynemouth, and edited by Horstman (1901). Also in *Acta Sanct.* June, vol. i, p. 392. It seems a very sober Life, covering real facts: after much travelling he settles in Western Britain (*Occidentalis Britannia*), where there are *llans* named after him, as *Llanbedrog*.

Several of these *Vitae* may be read abridged in the already mentioned *Nova Legenda Anglie*.

V. Lives of Irish Saints. Two of these are contained in Rees's volume of the *Cambro-British Saints*.

1. *Vita S. Aidui* (qu. Aidi?); other forms of the name are found—Aedus, Aidanus, Edanus, also for the same person Maedocus, Moedocus, Maedhog. We find him connected with St. David, and Bishop of Ferns in Ireland. Another Life, roughly the same, yet with many variations in names of persons and places, is published in *Aa. Ss.* Jan. iii. 727–35. New editions of both these Lives in vol. ii of Plummer's *Vitae Sanctorum Hiberniae*, 1910.

2. This is a convenient point at which to insert, on account of his relationship to St. David, a saint of that northern Cymric kingdom, over which Rydderch Hael came to reign. He is Kentigern or Cyndeyrn. Part of the *Vita S. Kentigerni* by Jocelin (*c.* 1180), a monk of Furness,

describes the exile which led Kentigern, at that time Bishop of Glasgow, to visit St. David at Menevia, and afterwards to build a monastery on the river Elwy in North Wales, now called Llan-Elwy. Kentigern left behind him Asaph or Asa, as abbot and bishop, after whom the monastery, with its church, was named St. Asaph. Of him we have no record beyond the brief notice in the Life of Kentigern. His youth as a monk, the love which the master bore him, the master's delegation of the care of the monastery to him, and his institution of Asaph as bishop in succession to himself, are there related. Information respecting Kentigern may further be derived from the following works:— Forbes, *Lives of S. Ninian and S. Kentigern*: Vol. v of *The Historians of Scotland*. Pinkerton, *Lives of the Scottish Saints* (1889). Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, vol. i. An abridged Life in John of Tynemouth's *Nova Legenda Anglie*, in Horstman's (1901) edition.

3. *Vita S. Brendani*, from Brit. Mus. Vespasian A. XIX. Only a fragment. Brendanus or Brandanus was Abbot of Clonfert (Cluainferta); his birth is placed A.D. 483 and death in 576. There have been published several forms of his *Vita seu Navigatio*, containing sailor yarns woven into the history of a saint; among the best is *Vita S. Brendani* by Bishop Moran from *Liber Kilkenniensis*, Dublin, 1872. In cc. 15, 16 we have a most interesting account of his close intercourse with Gildas; the *Oratio S. Brendani* given by Moran has many points of resemblance to the *Lorica* of Gildas (so called).

4. Finian, Finan, or Vinnan (Vennianus), Abbot of Clonard, which was founded by him about 520, until his death about 552. *Vita* in Colgan's *Aa. Ss. Hiberniae*, pp. 393–7. In this master of Irish saints we have an Irish companion of David's, during a time spent at Kilmuine (Kil-Mynyw), and of Gildas's as noticed in Finan's *Penitential*.

5. Comgall, Congallus or Congillus, also Comgallus, Abbot of the Irish Bangor. His death is placed in 600. He also connects North-Irish Monachism with Britain, i.e. with David and Gildas. *Vita* in *Aa. Ss.* Mai. ii, pp. 578–80. New edition in Plummer, vol. ii.

Instructive information may also be obtained respecting Celtic Monachism from the *Vita Columbani* written by Jonas, 'who holds,' as Krusch says, 'after Fredegarius, the very first place among Gallic historians of the seventh century.' This important work, the Life of a great Irishman, has been published separately, edited by Bruno Krusch,

Hannoveriae et Lipsiae, 1905. A mere look at the *Index rerum et verborum*, prepared by Wilhelm Levison, will reveal clearly the amount of rich matter found in Jonas's work respecting Irish Monachism (for the most part the same as British) when transported to new ground in Gaul. The same remark is true of Krusch's own *Index personarum et locorum*. The story of the kind British Abbot Carantocus is touching (i. 7). Among the Letters of Columbanus, all which throw light on the ways and temperament of a Celtic monk, there is one that describes a correspondence between Finian and Gildas. To him the two would be the Fathers, men of a generation or two earlier, yet he must have found copies of the letters at Bangor in Ulster, with Abbot Comgall.[1]

A list of *Vitae* is given at the end of Loth's *L'Émigration bretonne en Armorique*, but those which are of significance for our (present) purpose have been mentioned above. Others appear in Dom Lobineau's *Vies* and with a critical discussion of their value as records in de la Borderie's *Histoire de Bretagne*.

[1] *Monumenta Germ. Historica*, iii, p. 158. Finian and Comgall had both, according to the accounts given, been disciples of David and Gildas at Kilmuine or Cil-mynyw (St. Davids). Their names are found in the 'Second Order of Irish Saints', as having 'received their *missae* from David bishop, Gillas (Gildas) and Docus, Britons'.

CHAPTER XIX

MONACHISM IN BRITAIN: EARLY YEARS

It seems evident that after the visit, or visits, of Germanus, a new period opened for the Church in Britain. Not only, as was felt and stated, was it strengthened in the older faith, but ecclesiastical order was, apparently, intensified in the monachism which may have begun to spread within the island during the twenties and thirties of the fifth century. We are also inclined to attribute to the labours of Germanus the learning which gradually found a home in the monasteries of Britain, and through them in those of Ireland, where the daughter Church appears to have excelled the mother. Several of the names we meet with in the *Vitae* and other works, including St. Patrick, are brought into connexion with the life-work of Germanus, though some of them in palpably dubious fashion.

St. Patrick may be regarded as a Briton until about 431, when he started his great mission among the Irish; from that time our neighbours' claim must be yielded that he should be called and regarded as an Irishman. Riocatus is the first *resident* British monk known to history; he is certainly the first known to have been 'bishop and monk' (*antistes ac monachus*), for so Sidonius Apollinaris designates him.

After about 420–30 there came a long interval during which friendly relations or intercourse may have existed between the monachism of Lerins, or Marseilles, and Britain. St. Patrick was drawn to Lerins, and Palladius may have been at Marseilles before his arrival at Rome along with Prosper.[1]

[1] Palladius was at Rome in 429 and 431. But Prosper seems to name him as an acquaintance whom he had known before he himself had left Marseilles for Rome, and the supposition that he was one of those Britons whose piety was attracted to Gaul by the great reputation of Lerins or of St. Victor is not improbable.

It is difficult to reconcile the early date assigned by Prof. Bury to St. Patrick's stay at Lerins[1] with the history of that monastery as otherwise known. But he mentions an alternative hypothesis which seems preferable. According to that, 'Patrick's ordination by Amator precedes his return to Britain and his sojourn at Arles.' One might advisedly add, there is nothing in the *Confessio* to contradict such a view; neither is it inconsistent with the first *Dictum Patricii*: 'I had the fear of God as the guide of my journey through the Gauls and Italy, also in the islands which are in the Tyrrhenian Sea.'

In reading c. 43 of the *Confessio* we feel that St. Patrick's desire to go as far as Gaul in order to visit the brethren, and to behold the face of the saints of his Lord, implies that he had reached a riper age at the time of his first acquaintance with Lerinum than could have been the case in A.D. 411–12, 414–15. Patrick may have found his way to Lerins about 420, or later, and, if so, might, like Faustus and other Britons, have then made his first acquaintance with Gallic monachism. After being the disciple of Germanus he introduced it into Ireland, and 'sons of the Scots and daughters of chieftains are seen becoming monks and virgins of Christ'. Ere long it was British in character.

In the Life of St. Samson there is mention of a monastery founded in Britain by Germanus, which Samson restored. Lupus, the young companion of Germanus, had, we know, been to Lerins. Thus, along several lines of evidence, we are led to conclude that monachism, in the form of the South Gallic discipline, came to Britain probably not before, but certainly not long after, A.D. 420. This glimmer of light which appears to play about the persons of Germanus, Palladius, Faustus, and Patrick, in the beginning of a new

[1] *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 338: 'The following chronology, then, may be a rough approximation:—

c. A.D. 411–12. Escape from his ship-companions;
411–12, 414–15. At Lérins;
414–15. Returns to Britain;
415–16. Goes to Auxerre;
416–18. Is ordained by Amator.'

life in Britain, soon fades into darkest gloom. Beyond the second visit of Garmon, about 447–9, if that can be counted, we have, to my knowledge, no records until late in the second half of the fifth century of any further attempts in this island to make Church life monastic.

So far as British tradition is concerned, two individuals appear prominently in the early times of monachism. One of these, Dubricius or Dyfrig, is in no way connected with Gaul. He seems to have been a purely native Briton who, nevertheless, took his place in a movement that had come from a distance and had begun its course before his time. The other, Illtud, belongs to a younger generation, having been at one time a disciple of the former. The so-called Period of the Saints, which means the period of early monachism, had by this time begun. Probably these monks, whose names are known to us, were preceded by others whose names we do not know. Illtud is in various ways connected with Gaul. The more reliable record represents him as a disciple of Germanus, along with the Briton Briocus and the Irish missionary St. Patrick, at that time still to be classed as a Briton. But we cannot recognize the full reliability of the record in this matter, for it erroneously places the three at Paris. Yet Illtud may have reached Auxerre in his travels through Gaul, and so become acquainted with the school and traditions of Germanus.[1] Naturally the man of wider experience was also the man whose influence upon his age was the more penetrating. The whole tenor, even more than the actual statements, of all references to Illtud leads us to connect with his name and monastery a widespread reviving movement. As will be seen, it turned out a spiritual revival, yet it remained essentially monastic.

These two, Dyfrig and Illtud, could not have been the first representatives of their tendency, yet if tradition is to be trusted they are the earliest founders of monastic settlements known to us by name. There is another name we

[1] *Vita S. Brioci* in *Analecta Bollandiana*, tom. ii. p. 161. This Life, by an anachronism, gives the name as St. Germanus of Paris.

know, and that the name of a real person, who was not far from being as early as they. This personage, 'bishop and monk,' was Riocatus, whose two journeys between Britain and the south of Gaul, about A.D. 470, will be described presently. The three—Dyfrig,[1] Illtud and Riocatus—inaugurate a record of new spiritual sway in Christian Britain which lasted long; what is preserved of their record is, we feel, at best fragmentary, and too often disguises the real issues. We covet more, but the bulk is lost, perhaps for ever.

Dubricius, Dyvric.

The Life of Dubricius, which, as we find it in the *Book of Llandâv*, is a very confused piece of hagiography, makes him the teacher and older contemporary of Illtud, the master also of Teilo and Samson. To begin with there is an account of *The First State of the Church of Llandâv*[2] and a *Life of Archbishop Dubricius*. Besides the old story of Lucius, with the names Eluanas (Elfan) and Meduuinus (Medwy) who formed the embassy to Eleutherius (*sic*) added, Germanus and Lupus are introduced as consecrating Dubricius 'archbishop over all South Britain'. He is located at *Lantam*, with privileges confirmed by 'apostolic authority'. All this part seems to be simply the composition of the compiler of the Chartulary of Llandâv, writing in the twelfth century. There is, however, an older part, found by the compiler among the records of his church probably, and termed *Lessons from the Life of Dubricius*, *Lectiones de Vita Sancti Dubricii*, in which there occur a number of expressions taken, some verbatim from Gildas, others in substance from the Life of Samson.

Throughout this Chartulary of Llandâv, Dubricius is represented as the predecessor of Teilo at Llandâv; all the charters in it purport to be older records of gifts of lands, houses, and churches to St. Peter and Dubricius, or to the holy confessors Dubricius, Teilo, Oudoceus, and their successors. We have already noted the fact that Dubricius, in the

[1] *Dubric* and *Dibric* are also found as British forms of the name.

[2] *Book of Llandâv*, p. 68.

estimation of Geoffrey of Monmouth, who, at the time when the Chartulary was compiled, himself lived at Llandâv, was archbishop, not of Llandâv, but of Caerlleon-on-Usk. Such a diversity betrays to us the uncertainty or ignorance which existed as to the history of this man, though his memory was so firmly fixed in native tradition. We are compelled to believe that, as already suggested, a redaction must have been made of the sparse materials existing in the British tongue, enumerating gifts and tracing boundaries, and of the Lessons read on the saint's day in church, by a writer of the twelfth century. The rough material so worked up from British and Latin originals is perceptible in the records of boundaries which accompany every Latin entry, but are given, as known, in their ancient British form.[1] This redactor, as I conclude, was the compiler of the *Book of Llandâv*, who either followed a particular line of tradition or himself created Dubricius Archbishop of Llandâv, though the first bishop, or first named bishop, was, undoubtedly, Teilo.

The *Book of Llandâv* contains three Lives, which close reading will, I believe, prove to be all the productions of a single writer, who wrote not earlier than the time of the compilation of the volume itself. The Life of Dubricius (pp. 78–86), the Life of Teilo (pp. 97–117), which is a sermon, and the Life of Oudoceus (pp. 130–9), three successive bishops of Llandâv, were written at a time when it was held politic to attribute the consecration of Oudoceus to the Archbishop of Canterbury, i.e. about A.D. 1120, at which date the body of Dyfrig was translated from Enlli to Llandâv (p. 84). Late as these three Lives must be, we observe how the same quotations from Gildas are made in two of them; the same facts have been taken from the *Vita* of Samson, and, with almost verbal correspondence, a description of the great plague that caused the migration of so many to Brittany appears in the other two.[2] The three must be from the same

[1] This usage is also found in Latin documents appertaining to the English Church and State. While the body of a charter is in Latin, boundaries are written in English.

[2] On pp. 84 and 139 the quotation from Gildas (c. 4) is found; on

pen, and written somewhere about A.D. 1150.[1] One page represents the death of Dubricius as occurring in A.D. 612 (p. 84), another states that he was consecrated by Germanus and Lupus in A.D. 429! This is but a single example of the vagueness and uncertainty natural to the work of one writing more than five hundred years after the events he narrates, with no appreciation of the possibility of anachronisms, and clothing the few incidents with which tradition furnished him in the details of the life and ideals of his own day. It cannot be easy to determine how much should be stripped off, nor ought we rashly to attempt the task. There must be some real history hidden beneath the wealth of detailed narrative in these Lives, as well as in those parts of the documents which claim to be accounts of early synods, since a number of peculiarly British characteristics give a distinctive colour to all our sources.

It seems reasonable to place Dubricius (or Dyfrig) earlier than Illtud, but more minute dating than this is unlikely to be trustworthy. 'Dubric the high saint,' as Tennyson styles him, was no doubt bishop, and bishop of some other place than Llandâv, possibly of Caerlleon-on-Usk. In Geoffrey's work he is described as Archbishop of Caerlleon, and afterwards as crowning Arthur King of Britain at Colchester (*Hist. Regum Brit.* viii. 12; ix. 1 and 12, 13). But, in any case, Dyfrig, as teacher of such men as Teilo and Illtud, seems to have been connected with the beginnings of monachism in Britain before he was consecrated bishop; and he is represented as having divested himself of pastoral or episcopal burdens to lead the life of an anchorite.[2]

According to the only story of him now extant, Dyfrig was the illegitimate son of Eurdil (*Eurdila* in the *Nova Legenda*), the daughter of Pepiau, King of Ergyng. The mother and child were miraculously saved from the anger of

pp. 82 and 109 *Vita Samsonis* is used; pp. 107 and 131 give the same description of the *pestis flava* (y fad felen).

[1] The Life in John of Tynemouth's *Nova Legenda Anglie*, new edition by Horstman (1901), is a compilation.

[2] *Vita Samsonis*, c. 19; it was at Enlli (Bardsey) according to the *Book of Llandâv*.

the king. Dyfrig's sanctity was attested by marvels even during infancy. His *llan* was on the Wye; here he taught a vast multitude, among whom were Teilo (Teiliaus), Samson, Ubeluius, Merchguinus, Elguoredus (Elguoret), Gunuinus, Congual, Arthbodu, Congur, Arguistil, Iunabui, Conbran, Guoruan, Elheharn (Aelhaearn), Iudnou, Guordocui, Guernabui, Lornan, Aidan, Cinuarch (twenty in number). We notice that Illtud is not named, though on p. 71 he and Daniel of Bangor are included among the disciples whom Dyfrig dispatched in a quite uncanonical manner, some to churches set apart for them, others to churches built for them, and some he consecrated bishops of churches or sees (*parochiae*) in the southern part of Britain; Daniel he consecrated Bishop of Bangor, and Ildutus Abbot of Lannildut.[1] Daniel could not have been the first Bishop of Bangor, any more than David of St. Davids, or Teilo of Llandâv. Daniel is given priority because he made the place distinguished by combining in himself the two offices of bishop and monk.

Illtud, however, was the first Abbot of Lannildut. One thousand clerics are said to have spent *seven* years at Henllan[2] 'in the study of the literature of divine and human wisdom' with Dyfrig, who 'himself afforded them an example of the religious (i. e. monastic) life and perfect charity'. This account, however, cannot but be passed by as unhistorical, owing to its plainly mediaeval colouring. From Henllan he moved to Mochros, which is also on the Wye, and here he built an oratory and a house, living there many years to preach, and to teach both clergy and people, so that the faith was preserved in its integrity throughout Britain (p. 81). How common the thought of this last sentence, the idea of preserving the faith, appears to have been!

The Life of Teilo, as has been remarked, is a sermon in form as well as matter, and fragments of the same tone and with a similar objective appear in the *Lectiones de Vita*

[1] *Book of Llandâv*, pp. 80 and 71.

[2] Henllan must have been a place of some consequence at an early period: three Saints, Dyfrig, Illtud and St. David, were successively at the head of it.

Sancti Dubricii, as also in the *Life of Oudoceus*. From its early beginnings, as seen in these and other *Vitae*, British monachism unconsciously turned its monastery into a school as well as into a place for disciplined seclusion of life. At the head of such an institution was generally a popular preacher who inspired the same spirit of preaching in those who, while his fellow monks in their attachment to a single place—their *locus* as it is called, their *llan* or monastery—are still constantly spoken of as his 'disciples'. When, however, these British monasteries are described as 'schools', it must not be understood that they were 'colleges' in anything approaching the modern or even the mediaeval sense of the term. This error, with its misleading suggestions, has found a place in the pages of many writers. By some, the monastery of which Illtud, for instance, was abbot is constantly called the 'College' of Caerworgorn, and the abbot himself is styled 'principal'. This is the case in Rees's *Welsh Saints*, which set a bad example for later authors. Not infrequently these communities of the cloister are described—by a striking anachronism—as places where men were 'prepared for holy orders', or as nurseries of 'clerical studies'[1] or of 'theological study'.

It is true that in Gaul not a few of the best bishops were soon found among men who had spent some years in the seclusion and discipline of the monastery. Sulpitius Severus, speaking of the monastery of St. Martin at Tours, mentions the great number of bishops who came forth from that community, and asks: 'What city or church is there that would not desire a bishop from the monastery of St. Martin?' (*Vita Mart.*, c. 10, 8, Halm, p. 120). Eucherius

[1] Rees, *Welsh Saints*, p. 179. The *Lapidarium Walliae* by Westwood, p. 8, says: 'A school or college was then founded for "the instruction of those youths who should afterwards be called upon *to fill the important offices of the Church*, and thus arose the first Christian school of this description in the island of Britain, St. Illtyd being *appointed* the first superintendent of the school".' This cannot be a true presentation of facts if we trust the *Vitae*.

The same idea is found in Dr. White's *Latin Writings of St. Patrick*, pp. 225, 227, and even in Prof. Bury's *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 49, when they speak of 'clerical studies', or 'preparation for holy orders.'

of Lyon, in similar terms, describes the worth of Lerins as realized in the 'pre-eminent monks and strenuous bishops' nourished there. Yet these entered the monastery, not primarily for the education that was supplied them, but to practise, with all the enthusiasm aroused by a new ideal, the strict rules which led to a holier life. By its inclusion of reading and meditation, however, it provided for the youth, but only indirectly, a training and an elevation no less of intellect than of spirit. This point has been already touched upon; we repeat it. Men entered a monastery in order to be monks; the learning they acquired was primarily for this object. So youths were received by the abbots to be trained, as all the Lives show, with this object directly in view; were even taught the elements of reading and writing, so that they might repeat the contents of the Bible by heart, and form a more or less wide acquaintance with the Latin literature of Christianity. These, nevertheless, were not 'clerical studies', nor 'instruction for those intended to fill important offices', nor a 'preparation for holy orders'. Strange are the ways into which many of us fall, reflecting, as we do, the ideas and expressions of our own day, so familiar that they seem to have always existed, even in epochs and narratives of those epochs which did not know them. The monk as monk might be a learned theologian, and that a certain number should be found afterwards in the roll of active and successful bishops, such as Caesarius of Arles from Lerins, or David of Menevia from Lannildut, was the *indirect* effect of their monastic life. Indirect it was, because their school was first of all, essentially and always for them and for all others, a monastery.

The following passage well describes Dyfrig, his monk-disciples, bishops, presbyters, and abbots, ordaining and appointing in an irregular way. 'As St. Dubricius saw the hand of the powerful becoming liberal towards the church committed to him, he divided his disciples. Some of them he sent to churches 'given to him'; for others he founded churches and consecrated them bishops, as his own

coadjutors, after assigning to them churches (*parochiae*[1]) throughout the south of Britain. Daniel he consecrated Bishop of Bangor, and many others abbots and presbyters with inferior orders. Illtud he made abbot at the place called after him Lannildut.'[2] These can hardly be facts, they are only surmises. We feel doubtful about these *ecclesias sibi datas*, as the Chartulary calls and enumerates them. Yet the procedure ascribed to this bishop at the end of the fifth century, or, more probably, the early years of the sixth, differed so widely from anything the writer's own time could suggest, that we cannot but conclude that some evidence survived, either oral or written, which served as the basis of these statements. It is noteworthy, however, that two individuals only are mentioned by name—Daniel and Illtud—while the existence of many more disciples is presupposed, and, since the writer is almost certainly wrong as to Illtud, his statements respecting the relation of the Bangorian Daniel to Dubricius must be received with still more hesitation. A reconsideration of Riocatus at this point will be helpful.

Dubricius or Dyfrig has been dealt with first on account of the hazy atmosphere of legend that surrounds him. In his case a hostile and severe criticism of every tradition affecting his history is absolutely legitimate, but the history of Riocatus enables us to fix the exact time at which a man could be both bishop and monk in Britain.[3] A fact of this kind must presuppose a period of development in the history of monachism, lasting for a period of about forty years

[1] *Parochia* and *dioecesis* mean frequently, in the fifth century, church, a single church.

[2] 'Videns autem sanctus Dubricius largifluam potentum manum erga sibi commissam ecclesiam, partitus est discipulos, mittens quosdam discipulorum suorum per ecclesias sibi datas, et quibusdam fundavit ecclesias et episcopos per dextralem Britanniam coadunatores sibi, ordinatis parrochiis suis, consecravit, Danielem in episcopum Bancorensi civitate, et plures alios abbates et presbyteros cum inferioribus ordinibus, Ildutum in abbatem apud podum vocatum ab eodem Lannildut,' *Book of Llandâv*, p. 71. The construction is not quite clear, though the general meaning is evident.

[3] See our previous account of him.

or more. By 473 at latest, it may have been several years earlier, Riocatus had paid two visits to Gaul, presumably to see Faustus and other fathers of monachism in those parts, or to secure a supply of books, and was on his way home when Sidonius Apollinaris entertained him, and read the books he was carrying to Britain. No more is known. The record, however, enables us to infer that early in the second half of the fifth century British monachism was in close contact with South Gaul, and that the office of bishop could be, and was, filled by one who was also monk. It confirms moreover the opinion expressed above that the Church's blindness, so keenly felt by Gildas, could not have been due to the unprogressive character of monachism, but to the almost universal lack of recognition of its votaries by the official leaders of the Church. It was, in brief, unpopular with the leaders of Church life.

Iltutus, Illtud.

We come now to one whose reputation was greater than that of any of the ascetics about the end of the fifth century, or the first quarter of the sixth. The name itself appears in various forms—Heldutus, Hildutus, Iltutus, and Ildutus, which reappear in the British language as Elltyd, Illtud, or Illtyd. The *Vita* in Rees's *Welsh Saints* represents him as an Armorican Briton, which is quite likely; there was indeed a Breton Ildutus, as the place-name *Lannildut* in Brittany proves, and he may have been confused with the other. When the young Samson, himself born of British parents, was placed before Illtud, the master kissed him and blessed him, thanking God that He had thought fit 'to send this luminary to earth *from among our race*'. So reads this early *Vita*, earliest of all the *Vitae*, implying that Illtud was certainly a Briton. With this Saint the details of tradition begin to assume a greater reality and truth than has been the case hitherto. He seems to have exercised a wide and deep influence over his countrymen, yet many points in his life will remain probably always shrouded in uncertainty. His disciple Gildas does not mention him by name, though the conjecture can scarcely be incorrect which finds an allusion

to Illtud in the description of the master, whose teaching Maelgwn, 'the island dragon,' had abandoned. This prince, who, by the rashness of his cruelty, figures largely in the British *Lives of Saints*, had at one time been a monk. 'Drawn by a desire to return to the right way,' so Gildas addresses him, 'the consciousness of thy sins probably biting thee day and night during that time, first, after long meditations within thyself on the godly walk, and the rules of monks . . . didst thou not vow thyself for ever a monk? . . . With profit didst thou snatch thyself, like the dove from the ravens; thou didst with strong wing cleave the thin air in rustling flight, escaping the cruel claws of the swift hawk by sinuous windings, to the caves of the saints, those sure retreats and resorts of refreshment.' The vow was grossly violated. 'But warnings are certainly not wanting unto thee,' Gildas proceeds, 'since *thou hadst the refined teacher of almost the whole of Britain as thy instructor.*'[1] As the whole context suggests, Gildas and Maelgwn had probably been fellow disciples of this teacher, who can be no other than Illtud himself.

From different sources we know that four saints, pre-eminent above all others, spent the early years of their life at the *llan* or monastery of Illtud. Three of these, the Gildas already mentioned, Samson and Paul Aurelian, migrated to Brittany, where Gildas founded a monastery, and the other two became active Armorican monk-bishops; the fourth was David, or, as generally named in Welsh, Dewi Sant, who lived the life of a recluse with several brethren at different places until he founded a monastery at Mynyw (*Menevia*), called after him Ty Ddewi. Maelgwn, after his deplorable reversion to the former life of sin, still stood superior to other kings, a man of the strong lineage of Cunedda.[2] But he is frequently condemned as one guilty of inflicting cruelties upon the saints, and consequently was himself repeatedly the victim of the avenging wrath of heaven. There were prodigies, yet all appear of a conven-

[1] Gildas, *De Excidio Brit.*, cc. 33–6 of Maglocunus.

[2] The Genealogies, *Y Cymmrodor*, ix. 172: 'Mailcun map Catgolan lanhir, map Ennian girt, map Cuneda.'

tional character. In Gildas, a contemporary writer, we read of his wickedness, yet of no miraculous intervention to save him from the consequences of his evil deeds. But in the Life of Catoc, for example, and the Life of Padarn, he is portrayed as the type of those who could not escape the stern salutary spiritual influences which were growing in intensity and extension from the quiet though austere *llans*. The stained life, bowed in despair and remorse, found, as Gildas describes it, that 'the caves of the saints' afforded 'sure retreats and places of refreshment'. Even the remorse which resulted in conversion was due to these men of the cloister; it was called forth by the visible example of their extreme strictness, their utter unworldliness. Many too, it must be remembered, once converted by their influence, would, unlike Maelgwn, be far from desiring to return to the world or their own past life.

It is frequently remarked that monachism covered a selfish or self-regarding aim in which lay a deep inconsistency with the basal principle of the Church. Yet the mere fact of its rapid spread is evidence that it contained also in itself some further element which annihilated, or at least corrected, the self-directed aims of its discipline. Whenever the aim is very high, it is also higher than the individual; his striving to perfect even himself will draw others into fellowship with him. The Christian's best aspiration begins, and continues, with the cry: 'Remember *me*, O Lord; visit Thou *me* with Thy salvation,' for only by this path will he find that he is being raised to another larger aim, 'that I may see the prosperity of Thy chosen, that I may rejoice in the gladness of Thy *nation*, that I may glory with Thine *inheritance*.'

Soon the Church in Britain was almost transformed into a monastery. The early monachism of this island proved itself to be possessed of such a capacity for organic unity of purpose that it covered the whole land, almost appropriating to itself the functions and privileges of the corporate life of the Church. Nowhere were monks so clericized as among the British. I am inclined to seek the essential beginnings of this in the monastery of Illtud.

It has been already mentioned that, according to the *Vita* printed by Rees in the *Cambro-British Saints*, Illtud (Iltutus) was by birth an Armorican, born, as were nearly all the saints mentioned in the Lives, of noblest parentage. His father was Bicanus, a prince and soldier; his mother Rieingulida, the daughter of Anblaud, 'King of Britain.' 'At the catechumenizing of the child' (note the touch of marked mediaevalism in this idea of an infant catechumen) 'in the salvation-bringing baptism, the infant is named Iltutus.' When he was grown up, Illtud, trained as a soldier, crossed over to Britain to join the court of his relative Arthur; after a good reception there he was honourably retained by Poulentus, King of Gwlad Morgan (Gulat Morcaniensium), but before long, through the influence of Catoc and the intervention of an angel from heaven, was led to separate himself from all secular service (*a seculari servitio*). His eremite life begins in the valley of Hodnant; 'he won the victory as a lonely traveller whose companion was God' (*Vita*, c. 6, *capit victoriam viator unicus cui comitabatur Deus*). From Dubricius, here called the Bishop of Llandâv, not of Caerleon, he received, we are told, ordination and tonsure, even the *corona*, such is the mediaeval learning and confusion of this biographer. Hodnant, where Illtud settled, he tells us, had no hills or mountains; it was an open fertile plain and thickly wooded; a river ran through the midst, there were many fountains and a rivulet fed by them. The sea, afterwards miraculously fenced off, was not far away. The description of Hodnant would, in a general way, suit the present position of Lantwit Major or Llanilltyd Fawr, but the name Llanilltud does not occur anywhere in the *Vita*. King Meirchion, who was at first hostile, was brought by strange miraculous means to acquiesce in the new saint's settlement there, and even to make him a formal grant of the *parochia*. At Hodnant, Illtud was abbot, and this writer goes even so far as to say that as abbot he appointed fifty canons, who at stated times and fixed hours visited the church, each of whom also had his prebend, that is, 'each had his household with benefices, which were given by the people for

keeping alive the memory of their souls.' I have inserted this circumstance from the *Vita* in order to show how cumbered the narrative is by later fictions. It may be added that Hodnant, wherein the monastery of Illtud was situated, is also the very place selected by St. David for *his* abode (*Rosinam vallem, quam vulgari nomine Hodnant Brittones vocitant*, p. 124). In c. 26, 'William King of the English' rules over Britain, Robert Fitzhamon governs Gwlad Morgan (Gulatmorcantia). This statement once more draws attention to the late date of the document, a fact which explains the confused colouring of the Middle Ages which pervades it. It apparently contains some fragments of a metrical life. Note the hexameters at the end of chaps. 5, 6, 13, 14, 18, 23, 25[a].

It is quite otherwise with the notices of Illtud contained in the other Lives. The Life of Samson, the Life of Paul of Leon, and the Life of Gildas are considerably older than that of Iltutus, printed by Rees. This latter, evidently a *legenda*, a kind of memorial sermon read in church during the service on the saint's day, was written during the twelfth century; it agrees generally in style and expressions with the *Book of Llandâv*. The others are more genuinely real biographies, drawn up among the Britons of Brittany. They share, it is true, the same tendency to believe that miraculous incidents continuously attended the career of a 'saint', as was noticed above in the Life of Germanus by Constantius. This element, however, is only noted as being in keeping with what we learn to expect and presuppose in this class of literature. Beyond that it ceases to concern the historian.

The oldest of these is probably the *Vita Sancti Samsonis*, especially if taken in the form named above as *Vita I*, which can hardly be older than the later years of the sixth century, since the writer seems to be familiar with the Homilies of Gregory I; but, on the other hand, it cannot be later than King Nominoe (about 824). The Life, moreover, is a redaction of older materials (see p. 81 of *Anal. Boll.*, vol. vi). The writer had travelled over those parts of south-west Britain where Samson had laboured.

Memories of Samson and his teacher were then comparatively fresh, and the biographer characteristically records a visit which he paid to a columnar stone on which St. Samson had traced the sign of the cross, which had purged it of the pollution of idol-worship previously offered to it.[1] *L'Histoire Litt. de la France*, while severe in its criticism of the Lives of Armorican saints, yet pronounces the *Vita Samsonis* published by Mabillon an 'almost contemporary work', that is, one written about sixty years after the death of Samson. De la Borderie arrives at the same conclusion.[2] The narrative itself seems to imply this much to any careful reader.

The Life of Paul Aurelian (St. Pol de Leon) is dated by the writer himself, viz. Wormonoc, a monk and presbyter of Landevennec and disciple of Wurdistan. He dedicates the work in the year 884 to a bishop bearing the name of Hinworitus, but whether Briton or Breton is not known. He declares that it is founded on an older work, his own, though easier to read and clearer in its flow of language, being a humble *digestum* (cc. 2, 3). In somewhat the same terms we might describe the Life of Gildas—a very old original, touched up and supplemented by the monk of Ruys about A.D. 1008:[3] the line of suture is, I believe, plainly visible.

About the time when Illtud founded his monastery, the idea of sanctity was largely realized and acknowledged quite apart from any ecclesiastical function. Men of the highest moral force, of spiritual tenacity, and of enthusiasm

[1] The stone was probably a *maenhir* (menhir). The older *Vita* records that the sign of the cross was made by Samson 'with his own hand, using an iron instrument of some kind' (*sua manu cum quodam ferro*). But the later *Vita* makes him trace the sign of the stone 'with his own hand as if it had been softest wax'! On the *maenhir*, as object of worship of some kind in Gaul and Britain, Ellis Owen's *Stone Crosses* and *Revue Celtique*, xxvii. 313–19, may be consulted. Such stones were christianized by religious rites which included the incision of the cross, of which several examples survive; in Brittany they are called *pierres baptisées*. See *Revue Celtique*, xxviii. 128–9; *L'Histoire Litt. de la France*. See also Bertrand, *Religion des Gaulois*, Leçons i, iii.

[2] *Histoire de Bretagne*, vol. i.

[3] See Gildas, Cymmrodorion edition, p. 319.

that manifested itself in the power of inspired speech, found their way to the monastery. From the cloister, again, they reacted upon the life of the Church in general. The monastery, primarily and essentially a place of ascetic discipline, became also, secondarily, a school for young and old. In an especial sense there was a training for the youths whom parents, actuated by the story of Samuel, dedicated to the Lord. All lived under the influence of one ideal, that of monkhood, but the monastery of Illtud had *discipuli* as well as *famuli*, so that when the downfall of the Empire brought with it the ruin of the public schools, their place was supplied by the monasteries. 'In order to judge of the merit of these schools'—I quote from the *Histoire Litt. de la France*—'and of the care which the monks took of literary culture in times most deplorable, it suffices to know that during this century (sixth) and the six following, they furnished the Church of France in particular with a large number of learned bishops, and gave to the republic of letters a cloud of celebrated writers.' There had probably been before Illtud many abbots like Dubricius, who were also teachers, but Illtud's is the first prominent name that meets us about the end of the fifth and, maybe, during the first twenty years of the sixth century.

The account already given of the Lives of Samson, Paul Aurelian, and Gildas warrants us in putting aside the details contained in the twelfth-century Life of Illtud printed by Rees. At that time the monastery of Illtud was regarded as having been founded in a fertile, well-watered valley, to which the name of Hodnant is given, which may be the locality of the present Lantwit Major. Moreover, Illtud is described as by birth an Armorican. Both these statements appear to be corrected by the references found in the other Lives, and they, as has been already suggested, supply us with British tradition as it was carried over to Brittany at a time when, as there is good ground for believing, pious pilgrimages were made between the two countries.

The three Lives represent the monastery as situated on a small island (*insulula*, *insula*) which the Life of Paul, with greater minuteness, fixes as 'on the borders of Dyfed

and called Pyrus' (*erat autem quaedam insula Purus nomine Demetiarum patriae in finibus sita*). The Life of Gildas calls it 'narrow, confined, and squalid with arid soil' (*in quadam arta et angusta insulula atque arenti solo squalida*). One of the Lives says that, unto this day, the place with its monastery is called *Lanna Hilduti*, i. e. Llanilltud; the Life of Paul gives *Ilduti monasterium* as the equivalent (*quem nunc Iltuti monasterium dicunt*). The *llan* of Illtud is thus on a small island near Dyfed, that is, near the present county of Pembroke or in the immediate vicinity. The island, we are told, had its narrow area widened in answer to prayer. One biographer, we saw, gives the island the name Pyrus; in another *Vita*, an *insula*[1] lately founded by a holy presbyter named Pirus is stated to be near it. Thus it may be that the island before its occupation by Illtud was named after Pyrus (or Pirus), who became also head of a neighbouring monastery called by his name. These statements can only be explained by regarding Caldy Island as the original Llanilltud. Giraldus Cambrensis informs us, in describing Pembroke, his native place, that not far off was a '*castellum* called *Maynaur Pir*, that is, *mansio Pirri*; and to it belonged the island of Caldei, which the Welsh call *Enis Pir*'. On the mainland, as Owen's *Pembrokeshire* relates, *Maynaur Pir* (Maenor or Manor Pir) had been early anglicized into *Manerbyr* or *Manerbier*; in Fenton's *Pembrokeshire* it is Manorbier, as now. The Appendix to Fenton's work mentions *Ilston* in West Gower (p. 651, xi), which with *Yltynty*, by mistake probably for *Iltui-ti* (Owen's *Pembr.*, p. 361), may have preserved a memorial of Iltutus in the neighbourhood of Dyfed. Griffith Jones, Llanddowror, names (1747) *Capel Ylltud* in Pembrokeshire. The Lives of David and Cadoc convey the impression that the memory of Illtud had wellnigh, if not altogether, perished in most of the south-western parts at the time

[1] *Insula* appears to be used for 'monastery', either because monasteries were at first placed on islands along the coast, or because their land was isolated. This may explain the fact that *unus* is often found in place-names far inland, now generally farmsteads, but at first small monastic houses.

when their biographers wrote, that is by the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Thus such writers as the compiler of the *Book of Llandâv* and the author of the Life published by Rees had to turn to an existing Lannildut (*Book of Land.*, p. 145), to 'Llannulltud vawr', as the marginal reading on p. 340 shows.[1] In this way, the original Llanilltud on Caldy Island being forgotten, the name of a later monastery, called *major* or *vawr* solely, as was the case in British or Welsh names, because of its size, may have led writers of the twelfth century, and others after them, to regard Glamorgan, not Pembroke, as the country of Illtud. This is undoubtedly the case throughout the charters found in the *Book of Llandâv*, but there are good reasons for regarding these as no older than the compiler of the volume, if not his work. To the Synods held by the Bishop of Llandâv it is stated he invariably called 'his three abbots' along with the clergy from the Wye to the Towy. This phrase must strike every student of early church organization as curious—*his* three abbots, or the abbots of *his* three congregations. Their names appear, at different times, on two pages, on the one in Latin, on the other in Welsh.

p. 131 (first time).	p. 145.
Catgen, abbas Iltuti.	Sulgen, abbas Nantcarban.
Concerm, abbas Catmaili.[2]	Saturn, abbas Dochou.
Cetnig, abbas Docguinni.	Gurhaual, abbas Lanniltud.

In this book, the 'abbot of Iltutus' means abbot of Lanniltud, and the three places, Llanilltud, Nant Carvan, and Doche, were at no great distance from one another, nor from Llandâv, if we regard the first of the three as the monastery founded in the fertile plain of Hodnant—so the

[1] 'Nota his abbatem llannulltud vawr.'

[2] The monasteries are called by the names of the founders—so Llandâv is frequently called simply Teiliau, e. g. 'escop Teiliau', but it should be noted that *abbas Catmaili* is elsewhere given as *abbas Cadoci*, and *abbas Carbani vallis*, Cathmael and Cadoc being two names for the same person whose monastery was at Nant Carvan. Docguinnus, which even at the time of writing was, in Welsh, *Dochou*, now *Doche*, once covered a district that has become almost a part of modern Cardiff, i. e. our present Llandough.

contemporary twelfth-century biographer names it—but at a later time it was named, and is named to-day, Llanilltud Fawr or Llantwit Major. *This monastery I regard as a second Llanilltud*, the original being Caldy (Calde) Island. The inscribed stone of Llantwit Major, on which are the names Illtud and Samson, can have no bearing on this question, if i. e. the description given of it in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Christianarum* of Hübner (p. 22), and in the *Lapidarium Walliae* of Westwood (pp. 9–11), is closely followed, because it was not erected until near the end of the ninth century.[1] Moreover, the name Samson being not uncommon, the person commemorated on the 'inscribed pillar of Samson' (p. 13) may have been a different man from Samson of Dol.

From this small island of Caldy or Ynys Pyr, during a period that might comprise about ten years before and after A. D. 520, power and light, as from a British Lerins, went forth. We need not regard Illtud as the first abbot or teacher, yet his significance is marked by the fact that a new epoch certainly begins with him and the monks who came from his monastery. Westward his influence reached the sea at Mynyw (St. Davids); eastward it extended to Glamorgan, creating a new Llanilltut: in Ireland also, through his disciples, and in several parts of Brittany his spiritual force and influence were felt. Whether they penetrated places which were destined soon to become English, but which had once probably been seats of earlier British monachism, it is difficult to tell. Glastonbury is frequently mentioned in connexion with David and Gildas, a fact that may convey some suggestion of this kind. Its old British name, older than Glastonia, was *Ynys Witrin*, and meant 'island of Witrin,' or perhaps, 'monastery of Witrin,' and it might have been affected by the enthusiasm kindled through the preaching of Samson, Gildas, and David.

Illtud is the disciple of Cadoc in the *Vita Cadoci* and *Vita Iltuti*; he is also described as the disciple of

[1] See also Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, vol. i, p. 628. Westwood throughout, erroneously to my mind, speaks of Llantwit Major as founded by Iltutus.

Dubricius; in the other *Vitae* it is said that he was a disciple of Germanus. The *Book of Llandâv* naturally suggests the connexion with Dubricius, but in the Life of Samson it is expressly stated that he was a 'disciple of Saint Germanus';[1] the Life of David also, though specifying Paulinus as his teacher, nevertheless, in similar fashion, states that Paulinus was a disciple of Germanus. The first two statements cannot be proved or disproved absolutely, but it is known that Germanus died about 448–50, and that Gildas may have been with Illtud as a child about 510,[2] when the teacher must have been at least about seventy years of age. Moreover, the *Vita S. Brioci* informs us that Briog, when taken to Germanus, found Illtud and Patrick there already, a statement which carries us back to 432 or beyond, but renders it still more difficult to picture Gildas, Dewi, and Samson in any close monastic companionship and discipleship with Illtud. While most of these statements abound in anachronisms, and require no small care in their treatment, it is not easy to set aside the Life of Samson and its clear evidence as to Germanus. The monastery and traditions of Germanus continued long after him at Auxerre, and of these Illtud, like Patrick some years earlier, might have had profitable experience. Thus indirectly the spirit of Germanus lived on in Britain, or in a part of it, chiefly, as far as our knowledge goes, by the instrumentality of Illtud and the men who called him master.

The British, following the continental usage, called Illtud *abad*, and the *llan* or *lanna* over which he presided, though primarily a monastery, served also as a school. There is one striking characteristic common to all the allusions

[1] See above. 'Et ipse Heldutus discipulus erat Germani episcopi, et ipse Germanus ordinavit eum in sua iuventute in gradum presbyteratus,' *Vita Samsonis*, c. 4.

'Exinde perexit ad Paulinum scribam, discipulum sancti Germani episcopi,' *Vita S. David*, p. 122.

[2] It is impossible to be exact as to these dates: see on the computation of Gildas's age in the Cymmrodorion edition of *Gildas*, c. 26, p. 62, note. He was born, certainly, before 500: de la Borderie arrives at 493 as the year of his birth.

made to their monastic life in the *Vitae* of the disciples. They mention, on the one hand, a stricter rigour, voluntarily practised, than had heretofore prevailed; on the other hand, a new spiritual elevation which drove these young men of Illtud one by one, or in concert, to become the pioneers of a religious revival. Out of the secluded monk there was evolved a people's passionate preacher and prophet; this was Britain's debt to Illtud. For we are justified in concluding that these monks acquired their missionary zeal during their stay at the island monastery of Llanilltud.

I borrow here the description given of David's early community in Glyn Rosyn (Rosina Vallis), with the view of finding in it a picture of the monastery he undoubtedly copied; it will remind us of Jerome's account of an Egyptian monastery given already: 'When all things had been completed, the holy father decreed such rigour in the fervour of the monastic idea, that every one of the monks, daily exerting himself to labour with his hands, should spend his life for the common good; "for he who doth not work," the apostle says, "let him not eat."[1] Knowing that careless rest is the instigator and mother of vices, he laid the yoke of divine fatigue on the shoulders of the monks. For those who give their time and mind to the lassitude of indolence show an unsteady spirit of *ennui*, and are subject to passion that allows no rest. Therefore, applying themselves to their tasks, they work with hand and foot; they place the yoke on their shoulders; with untiring arm they fix spades for digging in the earth; they carry hoes and saws for cutting; they procure with their own hands all things necessary for the community; property they regard with disdain; they refuse the gifts of the unrighteous, they detest riches, they care not for oxen in ploughing. Every one is wealth, every one is ox for himself and for the brethren. At the end of work, not a murmur was heard; no conversation was held beyond what was necessary, but each one performed his appointed task

[1] 'Qui enim non laborat, non manducet'; the Vulgate reading is 'Quoniam siquis non vult operari, nec manducet'. The use of the ancient reading by Rychmarch is significant.

in prayer or well-directed meditation. When outside labour was over, they were wont to return to the cells of the monasteries and spend the whole day until vespers in reading or writing or praying; at vesper time when the bell was heard every one left what he was employed upon; for if the tolling were heard after the top or the half of a letter had been written, they rose quicker than was required for the forming of the character, and abandoned their tasks. Thus, in silence, with no talk, they seek the church. After the singing of the Psalms, with heart and voice attuned in harmony, they prolong their genuflexions until the stars in heaven close the finished day. The father, however, alone, after all are gone out, pours forth unto God secret prayer for the state of the Church. At length they meet at table; each relieves his wearied limbs by partaking of the repast, yet not to fulness, for too great a satiety, even though it be only of bread, produces wantonness. They take their meal according to their varying conditions of body or of age, not placing dishes of diverse tastes, or the more dainty provisions, but bread and herbs seasoned with salt, and quench the thirst they have from eating with a tempered kind of drink. For the weak or those advanced in age, or those fatigued by a long journey, they provide some delights of more agreeable food. . . .

'After the returning of thanks, they repair to the church at the canonical bell-ringing, where they are insistent in watchings, prayers, and genuflexions for about three hours. During the prayer in church none dare to gape, or sneeze, or spit. When these acts are over, they compose their limbs for sleep; at cock-crowing they rise, giving themselves to prayer and genuflexions, and spend the whole day from morning to night without sleep, and in the same way serve during the other nights. The time from the eve of Saturday [i. e. Friday night] (*a nocte sabbati*) until after dawn, on the first hour of the Lord's Day, when light shines, they spend in watchings, prayers, and genuflexions, excepting one hour after Saturday's matins.[1] They open their minds

[1] '*Excepta una tunc hora post sabbati matutinas.*' Rees has simply 'sabbath' three times; his reading, *dominica*, can hardly be correct.

to the father; they seek his permission even for the calls of nature. . . . They have all things in common; nothing is *meum* or *tuum*. For whoever mentioned "my book" or anything else would be at once subjected to harsh penance. They were dressed in mean clothing, principally made of skins; while there was unwearied obedience to the rule of the father, excessive perseverance in the performing of actions was prohibited to all.

'He who, desiring the way of life of the holy ideal, demanded to enter the society of the brethren was first to remain at the doors of the monastery for ten days, like a reprobate, and abide the trial of reproachful words. But if he endured, exercising patience until the tenth day, he was received, and being placed first under the senior who at the time presided, made his service; and labouring there for a long time, his soul broken with many adversities, he at length merited his entrance into the brethren's fellowship. . . .

'Voluntary poverty was loved; from whoever desired their way of life (*conversationem*) the holy father received nothing of the substance which he had parted with in renouncing the world, not even one penny, so to say, for the use of the monastery. He was received naked as if escaping from shipwreck; nor did he, in any way, extol and raise himself among the brethren, or relying on his wealth refuse to enter upon equal toil with the brethren. Nor was he, wearing his religious habit, to exact by force what he left to the monastery, or stir firm patience into anger. The father shedding fountains of tears daily, fragrant with the whole burnt-offerings of his prayers which were accompanied by incense, and burning with the ardour of a twofold charity [i. e. love to God and man], consecrated the due oblation of the Lord's body with pure hands, and thus alone after matins went forth to hold converse with angels.

'Afterwards he used to seek cold water, by remaining long in which, frozen, he subdued every heat of the flesh.

'The whole day was passed by him fixed and unwearied in teaching, praying and genuflecting, in care for the brethren, and also for orphaned children, widows, the needy, the sick, the weak and strangers, and in the feeding of the

multitude. So he began, continued, ended. As for the remainder of his discipline of rigour, although necessary for imitation, the intended shortness of this succinct account forbids us to set it forth. He imitated the monks of Egypt and led a life similar to theirs.'[1]

In this narrative, although such references as that to canonical hours, or to the Saturday vigil, show the clear impress of later times, the ideal of early monachism is described as it had survived at St. Davids down to the eleventh century. The combined result of tradition and reading creates the presumption that the picture, in its broad outlines, is quite true.[2]

The monastery was also a school, but, it may again be repeated, not a school for 'clerical studies' with a 'preparation for holy orders' in view. The school meant an intellectual training, on a specially Christian basis, yet chiefly for the better conduct of the ascetic ideal of life. Under Illtud, however, himself a presbyter as well as monk, there was fostered a greater interest in the spiritual welfare of those around them, which stimulated a certain number of those whose youth had been spent at Llanilltud to become effective preachers and capable pastors of churches.

Dr. Zimmer, speaking of 'the monastic school of Llanilltud', says that 'it was essentially a christianized school of rhetoric, just as in Gaul, in the fifth century, the old schools of rhetoric had been half transformed into Theological Faculties'.[3] Our oldest writer is the biographer of Samson,

[1] *Vita S. David*, Rees, *Cambro-British Saints*, pp. 127–9.

[2] Acquaintance with the *Instituta* of John Cassian seems evident in what Rychmarch has written, perhaps also with Jerome's writings. The ten days' probation for the novitiate at the gates of the monastery, the *senior* to whose care a novice was committed, &c., may be found in *Inst.* iv. 3–7. See, under St. David, a reference to writings preserved in the monastery.

[3] *Nennius Vindicatus*, pp. 326–39. Dr. Zimmer seems in this point to go too far, especially where he finds that the strange phraseology of the *Hisperica Famina* and of the *Lorica* of Gildas, as well as the style of Gildas's *De Excidio* itself, are to be ascribed to this Rhetorenschule of Illtud. On the *Hisperica Famina* and the *Lorica* the reader is referred to the Cymmrodorion edition of *Gildas*, pp. 298–313; Roger, *L'Enseignement des Lettres Classiques*, pp. 138–256, 'Les Hisperica Famina.'

in *Vita I*, c. 7. He states that Illtud was the 'distinguished teacher of the Britons' (*egregius magister Britannorum*), that he was 'most learned in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and the Fathers of the Church; in geometry, rhetoric, grammar, arithmetic and in every kind of philosophy' (see also *Vita II*, c. 4). The *Vita Pauli Aureliani* (cc. 6, 7) says that he was 'celebrated for his knowledge of sacred Scripture' (*vir genere nobilis et sanctarum scientia litterarum satis clarus*). Our *Vita Gildae* observes that 'the blessed Gildas was placed under a master's training in the school of divine Scripture and the liberal arts. Observing, however, the knowledge imparted in both kinds of teaching, he (Gildas) was anxious to be taught rather in the divine doctrines'. With these *Vitae* may be compared the *Vita* printed by Rees.[1]

It has been observed above that the Life of Cadoc is late, and much of what is contained in it is purely legendary. He cannot have been the teacher of Illtud, nor of Gildas, still there may be echoes of what was taking place through the land generally in the accounts which the *Vita* gives how Menthius, 'the holy presbyter and anchorite,' instructed him 'in Donatus and Priscian and other arts'; how also he was led to visit Ireland in his desire for knowledge (*discendi gratia*); how, near Brechen-iauc, on his return, he was taught 'Latin after the Roman manner' by a famous rhetorician named Bachan, lately come from Italy. Llancarvan was soon founded, to be both a monastery and a school.

We gather that the ascetic tendency of the monastery determined the character of the school, whatever in the way of the 'liberal arts' might have been taught in it; the school was destined to be and became an important centre of religious studies. Illtud the *abad* stands out as the first noted *teacher* of British monastic Christianity, the organizer of a school and studies. In spite of many defects, it was with priceless gifts of this kind that the Church was endowed which St. Augustine of Canterbury found in Britain.

[1] *Cambro-British Saints*, c. 7, p. 164, and c. 11, p. 167.

CHAPTER XX

PRINCES AND CHURCH

Ambrosius, Maelgwn, Arthur

The following works are the sources of the present narrative:—

Gildas. His *De Excidio Britanniae* is edited by Mommsen, *Monum. Germaniae Hist.*, tom. xiii, pars i; it is also published by the Cymmrodorion Society, along with the *Lorica* of Gildas, *Fragments*, *Penitential*, and the two Lives, *Vitae I, II.*

Nennius, *Historia Brittonum*; the work consists of an older part written by an unknown author about 689, and a later portion drawn up some time after 800. It, along with Gildas's work, is edited by Mommsen, tom. xiii.

Annales Cambriae and *British Pedigrees* (or a better name is *Annales Brittonum*) have been published by Mr. Egerton Phillimore in *Y Cymmrodor*, vol. ix. See also *Archiv für celtische Lexicographie*, i, ii.

Annales Tigernachi. This Irish Chronicle is printed by Wh. Stokes in *Revue Celtique*, vols. xvi-xviii.

Saxon Chronicle, edited by Plummer.

The *Lives* described above, Excursus D, after Chapter XVIII.

Henry of Huntington, Rolls Series, Book II, as published in the first edition of *Historia Anglorum*. The writer was acquainted with Nennius, Beda, and one form of the Saxon Chronicle (MS. *E* in Plummer's list). Henry also knew Geoffrey of Monmouth, of which acquaintance there are traces in the earlier parts of his *History*.

Beside these we must, I believe, place a group of British poems dating some of them before 800, which have come down to us mostly in altered forms and with redactions due to the literary activity of the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Geoffrey of Monmouth has probably drawn upon this material in his marvellous account of Merlin and Arthur.

British tradition has left no record of saintly kings, but the chiefs and princes to whom it draws attention are closely connected with the Church and the Saints of the Church in its hagiographic literature. There is great reverence for Ambrosius; detestation, vengeance, and subsequent recon-

ciliation for Maelgwn; while Arthur, at an early period and probably in many British songs, is decked out somewhat with mystery and glory in the fashion that was afterwards prevalent in the works of non-responsible writers.

In the eyes of Gildas the supreme moment of Britain's sin came when Guortigern called in the Saxons. 'All the men of council and the proud tyrant were blinded; the protection they found for their country—it was, in reality, its destruction—was that those wild Saxons, of accursed name, hated by God and men, should be admitted into the island, like wolves into folds, in order to repel the Northern nations. Nothing more hurtful, certainly nothing more bitter, happened to the island than this.'[1]

Before Gwrtheyrn, or Guortigern, and his counsellors resolved to invite Saxon aid, his countrymen had had previous experience of these enemies from the Eastern seas. Their earlier predatory visits, to which Ammianus Marcellinus bears witness in his narration of the deeds of Theodosius, father of Theodosius the Great, and of which we have also testimony in the appointment of the officer called 'Count of the Saxon Shore', are unmistakably alluded to by Gildas in the words: 'the men who, in their absence, were feared more than death, they voluntarily invited under the cover, so to say, of the same roof.' The story is well known, and needs no repetition here.

It is to be noted, however, that—a fact already frequently stated—the island was now Christian. 'While swords gleamed on every side and fires crackled, the inhabitants, along with the bishops of the Church,' so the sixth-century writer tells his sad story, 'both priests and people were together mown to the ground.' In 429 Germanus and Lupus made their progress through the island, and began a period of wide conversion, which was followed, a hundred years later, by what grieved the heart of Gildas and his circle of friends,

[1] Gildas, *De Excidio*, c. 23. The tyrant is not named, though one MS., *A*, reads *tyranno Uortigerno*, and another *tyranno Gurthigerno Britannorum duce*. Nearly all the MSS. of Nennius read *Guorthigernus*. Beda has the latinized form *Uortigernus*, in his Chronicle *Vertigernus*. The British form *Gurtheyrn* is still extant.

viz. a period nominally Christian, defiled by much irreligion and consequent immorality.

It is by no means easy to fix the date of this coming of the Saxons; it might appear easy, because the date supposed to have been settled by Beda is accepted and reaffirmed on all sides, written and rewritten as if it were beyond dispute. But it should not be forgotten that Beda constantly qualifies his date, or dates (for they differ) by the word 'about' (*circiter*): 'about 446', 'about 447', 'in the time of Marcianus and Valentius (449–57)', so that he only suggests the inference that the Saxons may have come by invitation to Britain some time between 446 and 457. *There are good grounds, I believe, for placing their coming nearly a score of years earlier.*

Two considerations of some weight point to this earlier date. There is a Chronicle, often quoted in the past as that of Prosper Tiro, or *Chronicon Imperiale*, but, since Mommsen's edition of the *Chronica Minora*, called the *Chronica Gallica*, in which two important notices bearing on this question are found. One of these, under the year 441, states that 'Britain, hitherto harassed by various calamities, . . . was reduced under the power of the Saxons'.[1] This not only points to an earlier date for the Saxon conquest, but presupposes one more early for the invitation of Guortigern.

The second consideration is based on Nennius. In this work, be it remembered, there are two writers. One of them, styled by Zimmer, Mommsen, and Thurneysen 'the Anonymous', takes up the narrative of Gildas about 689. In him, consequently, there is an authority two generations earlier than Beda. The other writer, whose name is Nennius, a disciple of Elfod, Bishop of Bangor, and Peulan the presbyter, contributes by additions and (seemingly) by interpolations much interesting matter respecting Arthur and the British in their struggles against the English in

[1] *Chronica Minora*, i. 650. This Chronicle (there are, in fact, two), compiled seemingly about 512 at Marseilles, is edited by Mommsen in the *Chronica Minora*, Mon. Hist. Germ., vol. i, p. 617, under the name *Chronica Gallica*. It is Prosper of Aquitaine himself that is Prosper Tiro.

northern parts. His information, he tells us, is derived from chronicles, Saxon genealogies, and, strange to say, from bishops, Renchidus and his master the Bishop of Bangor. These last suggest the close relations which prevailed between Northern Britain—the men of the North—and North Wales.

It is by the former of the two writers that the account of Guortigern and Hengist is given. Notwithstanding the miraculous element, which need not surprise any reader, this part of the work is marked by a sublime earnestness that gives to his graphic descriptions a tone of reality. Now it should be noted that Germanus of Auxerre is, throughout the main part of the narrative, closely connected with Guortigern; the base treachery of Gwrtheyrn, as well as his foul uncleanness, is denounced by Garmon, and it is from the terror inspired by the saint's indignant censure that Gwrtheyrn flies over Eryri with the futile intention of building a fortress (*arx*) further west. Driven again by ill success and remorse to a fortress near the river Teifi *in regione Demetorum* (c. 47), made more miserable still by his dread of the relentless, awful saint, and by deeper depths of sin, the wretched weakling perished in impenitence and under the Church's curse.[1] His sons, men of a very different type, with patriotic spirit carried on the struggle against the Saxons, under the leadership of Ambrosius. Their names, Guortemir, or Vortimer as Henry of Huntingdon calls him, and Categirn, are conspicuous in the records of the brave resistance which, for a considerable time, delayed the Saxon advance.

We may now turn back for a moment to the alternative date. This date, earlier by about twenty years than any given, or rather suggested, by Beda, in whose *Historia* no exact year is named, can by no means be ignored. When *all* his indications of time are put together they point to about the year 447, or even 446.[2] But in what has been advanced

[1] Nennius, c. 39 'Et maledictus est et damnatus a sancto Germano et omni Brittonum concilio.' The Council was a *synodus clericorum et laicorum*.

[2] The best summary and criticism of Beda's dates, or approximate

above chief stress has been laid on the relation of Guortigern to Germanus, which implies a date about A. D. 429.

Guortigern (Gwrtheyrn), Ambrosius, Hengist, and Germanus are contemporaries. If this is kept in mind, the time will be rightly understood as fixed by the fact stated in the anonymous writing that, for forty years after the death of Maximus,[1] Britain was a prey to fearful forebodings. Maximus was put to death in 388; add forty to this number and the result is the year 428. The same year is found under the names of consuls on p. 209, c. 66: 'the Saxons came to Britain in the consulship of Felix and Taurus,' which fell in the year 428. This year (A. D. 428), therefore, one concludes, was the date of that advent of the Saxons which had such vast and momentous issues for the whole history of our island. Garmon's mission belongs to the following year, i. e. 429, so that, strange to think of, the heathen Hengist with his pagan hosts, and Garmon the upholder and preacher of the orthodox Augustinian theology, arrived and were active in Britain about the same time.[2]

From this time forward the number of personages within the range of the historians' knowledge goes on increasing. Ambrosius was the first after Maximus to whom the title *Gwledig* (= patriot in English) was given. Though he does not appear in Gildas's narrative to be anything more than a Roman noble, connected by blood probably with one or other of the *tyranni* who had assumed the title of Augustus in

dates, with the frequent *circiter*, is in that given in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, p. 120. See also Plummer's note in vol. ii, p. 27, of his edition of *Beda*. A very searching and learned criticism of Mr. Anscome's view appears in the *Zeitschrift f. celtische Philologie* (1908, Band vi), by Mr. Nicholson, the Bodley librarian, who maintains the later date with many fresh suggestions. His strongest argument, one that voices a real difficulty, lies in the fact that Guortigern's compact with the Saxons is represented by Gildas as having taken place *after* the letter conveying the groans of the Britons to Aetius, whose third consulship fell in 446. The letter may, however, be a result of that perfidious compact.

[1] See c. 31, p. 171: 'Per quadraginta annos fuerint sub metu.' The year given on the following page, 'regnante Gratiano secundo cum Equitio, anno CCCXLVII post passionem Christi,' is impossible.

[2] See the remarks of Thurneysen in his review of Mommsen's *Nennius* in *Zeitschrift f. celtische Philol.*, i. 167–8.

Britain, yet in Nennius he is *rex inter omnes reges Brittannicae gentis.*[1] Ambrosius, on account of the signal services whereby he saved the British people, seems to have been given the kingdom and the position held by Gwrtheyrn. Of the three sons of the latter, two, viz. Guorthemir (Vortimer) and Categirn, fought, as has been said, under Ambrosius, while the third, Pascent, by the gift of the same Ambrosius,[2] ruled over his father's two regions of Builth and Guorthegirniaun.

Among these princes, all Christians, Ambrosius was most highly favoured in British tradition, celebrated in old songs (some of which were earlier than Geoffrey, and doubtless borrowed by him), and styled *Emrys Wledic*, his brother being Uthur Bendragon.[3] After the death of Ambrosius this Uthur (or Uther) was made king by aid of the magic powers of Merlin in order to continue the war against the heathen Saxons, and succeeded in satisfying his guilty passion for Igerna. She gave birth to Arthur.

It has been stated above of Ambrosius (Embreis, Emrys, as the British called him), that he was, in all probability, elected king by the Britons on account of the helpful patriotism which he showed and inspired in the time of their need, and that a later generation further attached to his name an epithet expressive of grateful reverence by calling him Emrys *Gwledig*. The title seems to imply, not the idea of overlordship, but rather that of *patriotism*. This is a natural explanation, but a somewhat fuller treatment of the term will be found in connexion with Cunedda, who is also called Gwledig. But going back to the plainer tale of Nennius, mention is also made of a man in the service of the Christian princes, whose name became as widely known afterwards as that of Arthur. This was Merddin, or as latinized by Geoffrey of Monmouth,

[1] Another reading, found in three MSS. (CPL), is *omnes regiones*, c. 48, p. 192.

[2] 'Qui regnavit in duabus regionibus Built et Guorthegirniaun post mortem patris sui largiente Ambrosio illi,' Nennius, c. 49, p. 192.

[3] 'Ab illo ergo die vocatus fuit Utherpendragon, quod Britannica lingua caput draconis appellamus,' Geoff. *Hist. Regum Br.* viii. 17.

Merlin, the famous magician and bard. The name itself is nowhere found in Nennius. It is Merlin also who says that his name was Ambrosius, and he was afterwards identified with the Ambrosius Merlinus of Brut and romance.[1] The boy, born without a father, spoke with strange superhuman wisdom, and quite confounded the perturbed soothsayers (*magi*) of Guorthigern. It seems quite probable in the case of this boy, so distinguished by his grave, dignified speech in the pages of Nennius, that the identification with the magician Merddin or Merlin took place very early, possibly in the sixth or seventh century.[2] Geoffrey found it and used it, changing the form of the name into Merlinus.

It is noteworthy how persistently the belief in magic continued to permeate this Christian life of Britain, among both people and rulers. Especially was this the case when

[1] 'Ille respondit: Ambrosius vocor, id est, Embreis Guletic ipse videbatur.' The meaning is somewhat obscure here. But this, it is clear, has nothing to do with Merlin (*Nennius*, c. 42, p. 186).

[2] Myrtin (*Black Book of Carm.*, p. 1, and frequently), Merddin (later hand in the same, p. 46), Merddyn, are different forms of the same name, which Geoffrey writes as Merlinus. Giraldus Cambrensis proves his knowledge of the older form when, although employing *Merlinus* himself, he asserts that Caermerddyn (Carmarthen) was the seer's birthplace. There are two Merddins or Merlins in British poetry, some of which purports to be of the sixth century, though certainly later than Geoffrey and his *Vita Merlini*. Unless the very language in which these poems have been preserved is not original, it is difficult not to believe that a remnant of what is very old, far older than Nennius, is embedded in substance in them. It was in them that the identification of the boy and the seer was made; but *Merddin Wyllt* or *Merlinus Caledonius* seems to have come solely from Geoffrey's *Vita Merlini*. On this subject there is a large amount of literature. See Skene's *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, vols. i and ii; *Merlin*, edited by H. B. Wheatly (Early Text Society), introduction to Part I by D. W. Nash; to Part IV, 'Outlines of the History of Merlin,' by W. Edward Mead. These last contributions were written before the works of Zimmer, Mommsen, Thurneysen, and Ferdinand Lot, *Annales de Bretagne*, 1900, avril–juillet, *Études sur Merlin*, appeared. Other French works by P. Paris and his son, Gaston Paris, with the latter's contribution to *Romania*, vol. xii, might well be named, but the others mentioned take up in their writings all that is important. San Marte, *Sagen von Merlin*, is by no means out of date. The dates, character, and bearing of British poems, some of which are held to be of the sixth century, will be discussed below.

a great calamity came upon them and men felt themselves utterly helpless amid overwhelming evils. It is said by Zosimus that while Alaric with his army stood at the gates,[1] even Innocent I, the Bishop of Rome, yielded to the frenzied cries of the populace and agreed that the ancient heathen auguries should be consulted.

A stage in the history has been reached which may be approximately fixed by certain dates and connected with certain names of persons well known outside the sphere of Church History. An attempt to do so is now made in full consciousness of the possible error which may lurk in thus marking time; but the conviction remains of the great utility of dates and names for the securing of a clearer perspective of the relative positions of events.

Gildas was in his forty-fourth year when he wrote the *De Excidio*; Maelgwn Gwynedd was then alive and an active apostate. Moreover, a promise to write such a book had been wrung from Gildas ten years previously by a band of friends who, like himself, were indignant at the wrongs they saw around them. There were also men living, at the time of his writing, who had been eyewitnesses both of the atrocities wrought by the Saxons and of 'the unexpected aid' rendered by Ambrosius Aurelianus, when, 'by the Lord's favour, there came victory.'[2]

Gildas describes both what he had heard from these eyewitnesses and what he had himself seen of ruined churches and desolated cities. 'The fire of righteous vengeance, caused by former crimes, blazed from sea to sea, heaped up by the eastern band of impious men.' These impious ones were the Saxons (*Saxones, Deo hominibusque invisi*), 'hated by God and men.' The fire kindled through them 'did not cease until it burnt nearly the whole surface of the island, and licked the western ocean with its red and savage tongue'. There is certainly exaggeration here, but nothing to warrant a late date for the work itself, or for

[1] Zos. *Hist. Nova*, v. 41. A proposed sacrifice in the Capitol is mentioned by Sozomen, *H. E.* ix. 6: 'Events, however, proved,' he adds, 'the futility of these proposals.'

[2] *De Excidio*, cc. 1, 2, 25, 33–6.

cc. 1–25 in particular. The author's recital of events which followed such a wild rush of the enemy, suceeded as it was by a compulsory retreat, his finding in Damnonia one of the princes he denounces, the repetition in the latter part of the same view of monachism as he had expressed in the earlier part, a similar tenor of thought and language: all confirm this view of the unity of the work.[1]

Gildas must be referring to the invasion of the West Saxons, and seems to describe the fate of his countrymen as follows:—(1) Many, priests and people alike, were killed in battle and in the carnage which followed the battles. (2) Many were reduced to life-long slavery. (3) Others took refuge in lands beyond the seas. (4) Some made the hills and rugged sea-coasts their refuge. These last, 'the remnant' (*reliquiae*), as they are called, with the assistance of their fellow countrymen, succeeded in wresting back cities and tracts of country from the terrible enemy. Two significant successes are mentioned as having been gained during a lull of invasion: the first came under the leadership of Ambrosius Aurelianus, the second by the siege of Badon Hill, both exceeding all expectations and hopes on the part of the British.

We may place the West Saxon arrivals during 495–514; from 514 to 519 there was severe fighting and carnage, but no great advance.[2] A fierce fresh outburst of hostilities on the part of the West Saxons seems to have taken place about 552, and afterwards in 556; at last came the crushing defeat sustained by the Britons at the battle of Deorham (now Dyrham) in 577, whereby the 'North Welsh', inhabiting the Wales of to-day, were separated finally from the 'West Welsh' of Devon and Cornwall. Bath, Cirencester, and Gloucester then fell into the hands of the English, while

[1] The full question of authorship and date cannot be discussed on this page. Neither *occidentalem oceanum* in this passage (c. 24) nor *lugubri divortio barbarorum* (c. 10) seems equal to the weighty conclusions that have been built on the one or the other, or on both combined, bringing the date down to 577 and after.

[2] See Plummer, *Two Saxon Chronicles*; Henry of Huntingdon, *Historia Anglorum*, ii, cc. 11–14, 16, 17.

the whole valley of the Severn, as far as Viroconium, lay open to them. The present history goes back to a somewhat earlier period, when there existed more or less contemporaneously St. David, Gildas, Samson, Paul Aurelian, Saint Teilo, Cadoc, Daniel or Deiniol of Bangor, Kentigern of the Llan on the Elwy, the five princes named in the *De Excidio* among whom were Maelgwn Gwynedd, Arthur, the bards, Talhaearn, Taliesin, Aneirin, Bluchbard and Cian.[1] Taking what is found in the Chronicles respecting the great plague and the death of Maelgwn in 547, along with (1) the other information referred to above—Gildas's ten years of brooding, his account of the Saxons (West Saxons)—and (2) that obtainable from other sources, the conclusion is forced on the critical student that these personages played their parts on the stage of history between A. D. 530 and 550.

The present writer is inclined to think that Maelgwn's relations with the growing monachism of the time were significant and probably quite different from Arthur's. In Maelgwn monachism had its enemy, in Arthur its friend.

Before proceeding further it will be well to note that at this period (530–50) *Britannia* extended, roughly speaking, from Devon to the sea. It included the valley of the Severn, Shropshire, Wales, Cheshire, Lancashire, Westmorland, Cumberland, to parts about the Clyde and the Forth. From an irregular line between the Dee and Humber, irregular because of hard contested conquests and reconquests about it to the Wall of Antoninus, there were several small kingdoms of Cymry (Cumbri, i. e. neighbours), whose territories, having a common name, had undefined or changing borders towards the east. This common name was Cumbria or Cambria.[2] The more northern of these were consolidated by Rydderch Hael, whose fortress stood on a rock in the Clyde, called Alclud, named also Dunbrettan, meaning the stronghold of the Britons. Along with him Nennius (c. 63)

[1] Nennius, *Hist. Br.*, c. 62; see below.

[2] Cf. Rhys, *Celtic Britain*, pp. 141, 142; de la Borderie, *Histoire de Bretagne*, vol. i, p. 241, who also had previously treated of the same subject in *Les Bretons insulaires et les Anglo-Saxons*, p. 81.

names Urbgen (Urbien or Urien) King of Reghed, Guallauc and Morcant.[1]

It is not infrequently asserted that the whole region should be called *Cumbria*, not *Cambria*, and that the correct form has survived in the name Cumberland, yet in the Life of Kentigern, both in the full biography and in the condensed account in the *Nova Legenda Anglie*, we meet with the forms *Cambrense regnum*, *terra Cambrensis*, *Cambria*.

In this northern neighbourhood, between the Wall of Trajan and that of Antonine, lay what was once the kingdom of the Gododin or Guotodin, which included, it is said, the ancient tribes of the Odeni and Otadini or Otodeni. It was from Manaw Gododin that Cunedda,[2] the great-grandfather of Maelgwn, proceeded to the parts now called Wales. The reason why he, a Briton of the north, came to these Britons of the west is unknown. It appears probable that, having a reputation as a strong warrior, he was invited to help against the Irish, who were harassing the Britons along the coast of Wales and making settlements there, just as the Saxons themselves were invited by the Britons on the south-east coast to assist them against the combined Picts and Scots.[3]

The British word *Gwledig* is generally attached to the

[1] Taliesin, in the poem *Anrec Urien*, mentions the number of princes as thirteen:—

'Lletaf y gled, balch y gkynded
Or tri theyrn ar dec or gogled.'

Myvyrian Archaeol. (Gee's edition), p. 47; Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, ii, p. 293. Though the whole tenor of the poem seems to connect it with those of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, this statement is of the very kind that tradition might carry down.

[2] Nennius, c. 62, p. 205, *Marvnad Cunedda*. Appendix p. 356 to Stephen's *Gododin*, edited by T. Powell for the Society of Cymmrodorion.

[3] A marked difference of opinion exists as to these Irish. Sir John Rhys holds that they were the pre-Brythonic Goidels, who had kept their position in these parts, and of whom the inscriptions bear witness. On the other hand, it is maintained that the inscriptions might have belonged to the Irish of this period of warfare in the fifth century. The present writer is not competent to give an opinion on the question of the inscriptions, but these descents of Irish hordes on the west or Welsh coast of Britain are an historical fact acknowledged by all.

name of this ancestor of Maelgwn, with the implication, it has been held, that he, as bearer of this title, perpetuated the power of the Roman Emperor, or the command of the *Dux Britanniarum*. He was a kind of overlord, accepted as such by other princes, from the Severn to the Dee, and even north and east of the latter river. The same power and function he transmitted to the heads of his family in succession, so that Maelgwn, though in his own proper kingdom he was only 'King of Gwynedd' (*rex Guenedotae*), yet held authority over all the Britons. To the present writer this view appears quite untenable. The *Dux Britanniarum* appears a greater personage than he really was. From the *Notitia* we learn that he was simply an officer who had command of the northern wall with, probably, the adjoining seas. He and the *Comes Britanniae*[1] were lower in rank than the *Magister militum* or the *Magister officiorum*.

In Nennius's work, where the earliest mention of Gwledig is found, it is applied only to that Ambrosius Aurelianus who, 'almost last of the Romans', helped the British in their hour of need. Cunedda is mentioned twice by him, once as king of Gwynedd, but is not called Gwledig. His and his sons' chief service was that they drove away the Irish, the Goedels or Gwyddyl, from Wales.[2] With

[1] *Comes Britanniae, Notitia:* p. xxix, *Dux Britanniarum*, ibid., p. xl. Associated with them in the suppression of piracy we find the *comes litoris Saxonici per Britanniam*, ibid. xxviii.

[2] Nennius, c. 42, p. 186 (Mommsen's edition): 'Ille respondit: Ambrosius vocor, id est, Embreis Guletic ipse videbatur' (He said, 'My name is Ambrosius,' that is, he appeared or thought himself to be Embreis Guletic (Emrys Wledig)). Ibid., c. 14, p. 156: 'Filii autem Liethan obtinuerunt in regione Demetarum, et in aliis regionibus, id est Guir Cetgueli (corr. Guire et Gueli), donec expulsi sunt a Cuneda et a filiis eius ab omnibus Britannicis regionibus.' Ibid., c. 62, p. 205: 'Mailcunus magnus rex apud Brittones regnabat, id est in regione Guenedotae, quia atavus illius, id est in regione Cunedag, cum filiis suis, quorum numerus octo erat, venerant prius de parte sinistrali, id est de regione quae vocatur Manau Guotodin, centum quadraginta sex annis antequam Mailcun regnaret, et Scottos cum ingentissima clade expulerant ab istis regionibus et nusquam reversi sunt iterum ad habitandum.' We may, following Prof. Rhys, translate *Manau Guotodin* as Manaw of the Gododin.

Nennius as sole authority Gwledig would best be taken as *patriot*; what is found in other writings, to my mind, confirms this view. The title belongs first of all to Ambrosius, *dux Ambrosius Aurelianus vir modestus qui solus forte Romanae gentis . . . superfuerat*, as Gildas says, with no mention of Gwledig (c. 25). When Geoffrey's *Brut* is examined, it appears that though each of the three, Maximianus, Maxentius and Maximus, is called Maxen, Maxen Wledig is only applied to the last, p. 111, corresponding to *Hist.* v. 9, where, however, the Latin has *senatorem*. Maximus was proclaimed emperor chiefly on patriotic grounds in opposition to the favour shown the barbarians. Emrys Wledig is read on pp. 102, 126, 127, but in the Latin simply Ambrosius; the Gwledigs of the Welsh Bruts are Maxen, then Emrys, then Cynan, successor of the Cystenyn who followed Arthur. The title Gwledig was applied to quite a number of undistinguished men; it is especially common in the British poems, with the meaning of *lord*.

During the literary period the meaning *patriot* might suit all, with the additional implication of 'chief', or 'worthy chief'. When Arthur is spoken of as *ipse dux bellorum* by Nennius, such a phrase cannot convey the meaning of 'overlordship' as in the ordinary explanation of *Gwledig*.

Gildas seems compelled to acknowledge a certain notable superiority in Maelgwn to all the princes of his time. He had no specified or recognized official position, yet he occupies a more prominent place in the pages of Gildas than any of the four princes similarly singled out by him for denunciation, although he was without the supposed status of a prince, and not known to, or acknowledged by, other princes. But in the *Vitae* of the Saints, Maelgwn is the mighty King of Gwynedd, and is represented as the dreaded, but afterwards repeatedly humiliated, enemy.

We do not know much about the four princes mentioned. It was Gildas's purpose to be a prophet, not an historian, but his words happen to tell us something about the Church.

Constantine, the first of them, 'the tyrannical whelp of the unclean lioness Damnonia,' had been guilty of both

perjury and murder in the very year that the words of rebuke were written. His oath had been made first to God, then also to 'the choirs of saints'; his murderous deed had been committed 'in the garb of a holy abbot'. The reference to the *monachized* Church, contained in the words 'choirs of saints' and 'holy abbot', as predominant in Dumnonia is clear. The rebuke to its ruler is spoken by a simple monk. 'Come now!' he says, 'I reprove, as if present, one whom I know to be yet surviving. Why art thou confounded, thou murderer of thine own soul? Why kindlest thou, of thine own accord, the ceaseless flames of hell against thyself?' Yet Gildas can be tender also, for a few lines further on he says: 'Turn thine eyes back, I beseech thee, and come to Christ, since thou labourest and art bent down with thy huge burden, and He, as He has said, will give thee rest. Come to Him who willeth not the death of a sinner, but that he should be converted and live; break, according to the prophet, the chains of thy neck, thou son of Zion.'

The 'lion's whelp', Aurelius Caninus, is introduced with no indication of his place of origin or sovereignty appended to his name. Yet 'murders, fornications, adulteries, like waves of the sea rush fatally upon him'. Appeal and threat mingle here again.

And to the third: 'Why also art thou, Vortiper, tyrant of the Demetians, foolishly stubborn? Like the proud pard art thou, in manners and wickedness of various colours, though thy head is now becoming grey.' This prince of Dyfed is called Guortepir map Aircol map Triphun in the British pedigrees; his father's name, Aircol, would be Agricola in its original Latin form.

Of the fourth, we only know his name and crimes. He is Cuneglasus, which name, so read, is regarded as the original of which Cynlas is an abbreviation. *Cune*—it may have an older form *Cuno*—is found in several names, such as *Cunomaglus* (Cynfael), *Cunovalus* (Cynwal), *Cunobelinus* (Cynfelyn), &c.[1] We may note that the pedigrees, where

[1] See Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, sub voce; Rhys, *Celtic Britain*, p. 286; *The Academy*, Oct. 12 and 19, 1895.

Cinglas is written, make him a descendant, a great-grandson, of Cunedda, as was Maelgwn: 'Cinglas map Eugein Dant gwin, map Enniaun Girt, map Cuneda.' Maelgwn is 'Mailcun map Catgolan Lauhir, map Enniaun Girt, map Cuneda'.[1] If this be correct the two had the same grandfather, Enniaun. Cinglas is addressed, with the privilege allowed to monks, in the same tone of earnest, fearless rebuke: 'Why dost thou maintain such strife against both men and God? Against men, thine own countrymen, to wit, by arms special to thyself; against God, by crimes without number. . . . Change thy life, and cause them to pray for thee to whom is given the power to bind above the world, when they have bound guilty men in the world, and to loose, when they have absolved the penitent.'[2]

Maglocunus, our Maelgwn, is addressed last. 'Thou last in my writing, first in wickedness, exceeding many in power (*potentia*), and at the same time in malice, more liberal in giving, more excessive in sin, strong in arms but stronger in what destroys thy soul.' *The two, writer and prince, knew each other; the monk is of the two the more fearless.* But Gildas will only refer to those crimes of Maelgwn which were known far and wide. He had crushed his uncle, probably the Eugein mentioned above, 'in the years of his youth,' when 'followed by brave soldiers, whose countenance in battle appeared not very unlike that of young lions'. Afterwards he tells him, 'With the consciousness of thy sins biting thee day and night, thou didst take upon thyself the vow and rule of a monk with the hope of finding in the

[1] From the Harley MS., edited in vol. ix of *Y Cymmrodor* by Mr. Egerton Phillimore, put in index form by Mr. Anscombe in *Archiv für celtische Lexicographie*, i, ii.

[2] 'Fac eos mutatis pro te orare moribus, quibus suppedit supra mundum alligandi, cum in mundo reos alligaverint, et solvendi, cum poenitentes solverint, potestas,' c. 32. Cf. c. 109: 'Itemque omni sancto sacerdoti promittitur; *et quaecumque solveris*,' &c., as in Matt. xvi. 19. But he asks, 'How will *you* loose anything . . . ? With what reason shall *you* bind on earth anything that may, in an extraordinary degree, be bound, besides your own selves who, bound to iniquities, are so held in this world, that in no sense do you ascend to heaven?'

abodes of the saints sure retreats and places of refreshment'.[1]

But Maelgwn was contemptuous of Gildas. His conversion—the word is technically used for becoming a monk—had, when Gildas wrote, become an 'accursed reversion'; and it is a man stained by a violated vow (*post monachi votum inritum*) who regards his old acquaintance with contempt.[2]

While later writers represent Maelgwn as building castles in several places—Deganwy, Digoll, Cyffin, Collwyn—and acting in a way friendly to the Church, in Gildas's pages he is endowed, indeed, with splendid powers for rule and war, but is guilty of mortal sins. In the Lives of the Saints, however, he is an object of aversion on account of deeds not actually attributed to him by Gildas. It may be that, stung by the prophetic denunciations of the *De Excidio*, the backslider conceived a strong antipathy against monks of all kinds and degrees. Such a feeling might have found support even among many bishops. Apart from those directly attacked, there were bishops who had 'obtained the apostolic throne in the regular way—*qui apostolicam sedem legitime obtinent*' (c. 92)—who might also entertain a strong aversion to the spread of asceticism by the foundation of monastery after monastery, subject to no recognized rule. Such, of course, had been the experience of monks elsewhere, but Maelgwn, in the Life of Padarn, described as King of the North Britons, and as making war upon the South

[1] *De Excidio*, c. 34 'Monachumsi ne ullo infidelitatis, ut *aiebas* respectu ... (note the imperfect tense) perpetuo vovisti ... sinuosis flexibus vitantem ad sanctorum tibi magnopere fidas speluncas refrigeriaque salubriter rapuisti ex corvo columbam.' We mark in *ut aiebas*—'as thou wert wont to say'—the old intimacy between the two men, probably at Llanilltud. *Speluncae*, caves, was an old affectionate term for monastery, borrowed from the Greeks.

[2] c. 36: 'Nosque, licet vilissimae qualitatis simus, nullius momenti ducas.' 'Me, a man of lowest condition, I grant, thou regardest as of no weight, though, at any rate, I keep that word of the prophet in sincere godliness of mind. I shall surely fill my strength with the spirit and power of the Lord ... lest I be as dumb dogs that cannot bark.' This monk knew no fear.

Britons, is called *par excellence* 'the constant assailant of the saints (the monks)'.[1] The *Vita Cybi* also (pp. 186, 187) represents Mailgun rex Guenidocie as in conflict with that saint once and yet again, but only to find himself 'impotent to resist the servant of God'. With Cadoc as well this same Mailcunus rex Guinedotiorum [2] is made to feel the anger of heaven. Some of the poems attributed to Taliesin, which may be, at the latest, of the same age as these *Vitae*, paint him in similar colours.[3] Poetry and hagiography tell one and the same tale.

The worldly attack of brute force made on holy men, invariably thwarted, ended in reconciliation; ample gifts also came to the saint and his monastery—lands to Padarn, a castle to Cybi, right of asylum to Cadoc. Maelgwn, the penitent, was certainly in these representations, as Gildas said of him, *profusior in dando*. Through the discrepancies and fictions of the Lives, in Maelgwn, nevertheless, a king appears who dared to oppose the flood-tide of monachism about the end of the first half of the sixth century. Others, better men than he, were inclined to the same point of view. Maelgwn was violent, and his harsh measures ended in failure. His frequent penances, though described in the conventional way of mediaeval hagiography, may be regarded as showing how a strong-minded, worldly, and ambitious prince of that age failed to grasp the spiritual unworldliness, the moral tenacity which gave to the ascetic his great power and influence. He, after all, apparently

[1] *Vita S. Paterni*, p. 191 'Interea Mailgun rex borealium Brittonum, australes Brittanos ad bellandos et subiciendos visitans, cum forti exercitu ad usque ostium fluminis Clarach venit. Ac quum *ipse semper temptator sanctorum* aderat . . .'

[2] *Vita S. Cadoci*, c. 19. Earlier in the chapter we read 'rex quidam nomine Mailgunus in tota Brittannia regnabat'.

[3] *Myvyrian Archaeology* (Gee's edition), p. 35. The following is quoted verbatim:—

'I ddial enwiredd
Ar Faelgwn Gwynedd,
A'i flew a'i ddannedd
A'i lygaid yn euredd,
A hun a wna ddiwedd,
Ar Faelgwn Gwynedd.'

succumbed to those passive, stern ascetics who proved themselves stronger than his turbulent will.

Arthur, on the other hand, was seemingly a prince whose heart was given to the Church and the saints, though with strange shortcomings, if we have regard to some of the *Vitae*. Unfortunately the very writer who could provide a contemporary account of Arthur is silent about him. Gildas must have been a contemporary, but either he had no complaint against Arthur, or the latter's career of warfare against the Saxons became famous and prominent after the writing of the *De Excidio*. Gildas wrote during a time of peace which had lasted, for the most part, since the siege of Mons Badonicus, a period of forty-three years and one month. This he knew because he was born in the year of that decisive day. Maelgwn, King of Gwynedd, died about 547 according to the *Ann. Cambriae*. Upon many grounds it may be concluded that Arthur was for some years the contemporary of Maelgwn, perhaps his companion in arms, but that after his death Arthur's achievements eclipsed all that had been previously recorded.

Against this hypothesis certain seemingly definite records at once create some difficulty. These records, however, bear distinct marks of the use of legendary material. They form that part of the *Historia Brittonum* which is now generally accepted as belonging to about 810. In this year the original work of 689 was extended by additions due to the pen of that disciple of Elfod, Bishop of Bangor, who calls himself Nennius. He had also a certain presbyter named Beulan, or Peulan, as his teacher (*magister*), to whose son Samuel he addresses a number of verses in the Prologue. Elfod, 'Archbishop of Gwynedd' according to *Brut y Tywysogion*, died about, or after, A. D. 800,[1] so that his disciple might have finished his redaction of the old *Historia Brittonum* during the first quarter of the ninth century. It is in the work of this redactor that we find the *Arthuriana* referred to. He writes, about 810–25, of events which must be placed, by his description, about the year 500. After Hengist's death, Octha—as he calls his son—succeeded him.

[1] *Brut*, Evans's ed., p. 253; the next date is 810.

Then Arthur fought against the Saxons, aided by the kings of Britain, but himself 'the leader in the wars'. Moreover, the twelfth of those victorious battles which Arthur waged, where he killed, with his own hand, 960 men, was that of *Mons Badonis*; but Gildas informs us that this battle was fought in the year of his own birth, which must have been shortly before or shortly after 500. According to this account, he fought valiantly and piously for his people and religion long before Maelgwn, Gildas's contemporary, came on the scene. It is noteworthy that in the judgement of this early ninth-century writer Arthur was not only brave but religious, for in the eighth battle he 'carried the image of holy Mary ever virgin on his shoulders, and the heathen were routed with great slaughter by the might of our Lord Jesus Christ and by the might of the holy Virgin Mary His mother'. The *Annales Cambriae*, which has a close connexion with the *Arthuriana* of Nennius, adds that in the same battle he 'carried the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ three days and three nights on his shoulders, and the Britons were victorious'.[1] The Arthur depicted in these passages is a very different king from Maelgwn, but there hovers around him a bright thin cloud of legend which arouses suspicion, not altogether as to the substance, perhaps, but as to the form and details of the narrative ostensibly presenting facts of earlier times. Attempts to fix the chronology based on such hazy narratives as these cannot be trusted. In addition to other things which can only be accepted with difficulty, there are even many definite dates in the work which are sadly in need of correction.[2] The

[1] This reference to 'three days and three nights' is probably the echo of another story which some MSS. of Nennius introduce here: 'For Arthur travelled to Jerusalem, and there made a cross of the same size (*ad quantitatem*) as the salvation-bringing cross; it was consecrated there, and for three successive days he fasted, watched, and prayed before the Lord's cross' (Mommsen, p. 200).

[2] E. g. p. 145, *a passione autem Christi*, 796 (see Mommsen's notes); p. 158, St. Patrick's mission to Ireland 405 *a nativitate*; but again, p. 159, *ab incarnatione*, 438; p. 164, *a papa Romano Eucharisto*, 167; p. 167, Romans ruled in Britain 409 years; p. 172, the Saxons come, invited by Guortigern, anno 347 *post passionem Christi*.

representation here is that of an Arthur of about A. D. 500 as he appealed to a writer of the ninth century, who wove together the stories of the religious king's valour, glory, and discretion in the way that poetic tradition had handed them down in Powys and Bangor and among the Cymry of Cumbria.

Geoffrey of Monmouth, who hardly ever ventures upon any date, places the death of Arthur after the battle of Camlan, where he killed Modred, and was himself mortally wounded, in A. D. 542. This is a date about forty years later than that favoured by Nennius, yet, even so, Arthur died, according to this account, before Maelgwn. The amount of credence to be given to Geoffrey should be plain from the fact that, on his own initiative, he makes four of the five *contemporary* princes against whom Gildas directs his attacks, *successive* kings of Britain: Constantine of Dumnonia, as Constantine son of Cador dux of Cornubia (Iarll Kernyw in the Welsh version), Aurelius Conanus, Wortiporius, lastly Malgo, who is our Maelgwn Gwynedd. No chronological order of this kind can be tolerated. Yet it was such details that disappeared during the Middle Ages, when Geoffrey's work of genius, his *Historia*, gained its wide acceptance and popularity with its bold picture of Arthur as a British hero, delineated to the peoples of Western Europe as the champion of the freedom of his country against savage enemies, the defender of the Cross and the Church against those heathen hordes. The student of Nennius must be convinced that the real historical Arthur is not lost even in Geoffrey's work; he is only transformed mainly through the perspective created by the writer's own age and imagination.

Henry of Huntingdon, in the *Historiae Anglorum*, ii. 18, seems to place Arthur after the battle of Certisford (also known as Certideag), which the Chronicles place in 527, but the whole chapter is simply a restatement of what is found in Nennius.[1]

[1] Henry mentions Gildas as the author from whom he quotes. It is found that two MSS. of the *Historia Brittonum*, which Mommsen desig-

To return to Nennius. An examination of his account of Arthur's twelve battles reveals the fact that some of them, at any rate, must be located in the neighbourhood of the more northern wall, or *vallum Antonini*. The most natural reconstruction of the facts seems to be that Arthur's warfare took place in the north and in the south; in the south he fought against the West Saxons, in the north against the Angles of Bernicia. It is difficult, nay, it is impossible, to accept Skene's conclusions, that Arthur's battles were fought against Octa, Hengist's son, and Ebissa, his nephew, during the expedition to the north described by Nennius (c. 38).

The attempt made by Skene to confirm his views by a reference to this chapter of Nennius is plainly nullified by the mention of Octa's return southwards after Hengist's death *in order to fight Arthur*; the northern attack was evidently a diversion that came to a comparatively speedy end through Arthur's activity elsewhere.[1]

The main conclusion, the only one that can be deduced from all early accounts, is that the Arthur known to popular literature must be an Arthur of romance, the creation of Geoffrey of Monmouth, yet not devoid of historical features. These features imply a friendliness to the Church, to its faith, its order and ascetic institutions, constituting in each respect a complete contrast to Maelgwn Gwynedd. In neither case, with friend or foe, is there any intimation of a relation between State and Church beyond the prince's own personal relation.

nates as P, Q, are the leading representatives of a particular text. These MSS. omit Mommsen's cc. 57–66, insert a list of Roman provinces in c. 17, and, for the most part, attribute the work to Gildas.

[1] *Nennius*, c. 56, p. 199 'Mortuo autem Hengisto Octha filius eius transivit de sinistrali parte Britanniae ad regnum Cantorum et de ipso orti sunt reges Cantorum. Tunc Arthur pugnabat contra illos cum regibus Brittonum, sed ipse dux erat bellorum.' Mark the precise connexion in which this last often-quoted passage occurs.

CHAPTER XXI

GROWTH OF MONACHISM

That there was in Britain at the close of the sixth and beginning of the seventh century a great spiritual movement—a tide of the spirit rising and filling many, if not all districts—may be clearly gathered from a study of the different *Vitae* and other literary monuments of this period. There were legions of saints, and the character of their saintliness was that of an advanced monachism.

This monachism to a great extent transformed and absorbed other spiritual forces and religious customs. It had, however, its own peculiar characteristics both in Ireland and in Britain. Finian of Clonard, and Comgall of Bangor in Ulster, were contemporaries of Gildas and David, the four being distinguished 'for holiness of life and rigour of rule'.[1] They were also contemporary with that Benedict who, in 528, founded the monastery of Monte Casino, and drew up a superior *regula*, which was destined to supplant and outlive what had been in the time we treat of a great uplifting power in Britain and Ireland. This uplifting was a fervour of holiness which spread quickly over the land, but was always dominated by the vigour and rigour of extreme monastic asceticism.

Monachism was not at this height, or, more properly, its influence was not fully acknowledged, during the ten years when Gildas and his friends were meditating their protest against cruel princes and indifferent priests (*sacerdotes*), including under this term both bishops and presbyters.

The home of this British monachism has been found in the institutions which clustered at and around two important

[1] 'In sanctitate vitae et regulae rigore,' *Vita Comgalli*, i. 4. *Regula* has here its technical meaning, the rule by which monks lived their common life.

centres, Lerins and Marseilles. It seems highly probable that in northern Scotland there may have been at a slightly earlier period some rude imitation of the monastic life of St. Martin, introduced by Nynias, but afterwards, owing to the influx of fresh missionary activity that came through Irish monks, yielding to the Irish model, which was originally British. In time the strict Irish institutions founded by Columbanus and Luxeuil (*c.* 585) and Bobbio (*c.* 612) on the Continent were superseded by the milder and better rule of St. Benedict. The same change came over Britain and Ireland. The British foundations were certainly somewhat pliant in their rules, though the members of all of them were closely united by the power of a strong common aim; still the Benedictine order proved that by its very moderation it introduced elements which better tended to safeguard the permanence required in the life of a community. This, however, was as yet a thing of the future, and at the time now under consideration would have been accounted impossible.

To Gildas the 'saints' appeared 'few, very few' (c. 26), although Britain had bishops in plenty; *speculatores*, by whom must be meant the official spiritual leaders of the Church, were, 'if not too many, not too few' (c. 2); 'priests Britain has, but foolish ones; a great number of ministers, but shameless; pastors it has, so to say, but they are wolves ready for the slaughter of souls, certainly not providing what is of benefit for the people, but seeking the filling of their own belly: men have churches, but enter them for the sake of filthy lucre' (c. 66). Such is the language of a monk, writing about A.D. 530–40, fired by the reformer's uncompromising zeal, who may, no doubt, be exaggerating, as in c. 31, where the 'pastors who ought to have been an example to the flock' are described as being 'in great numbers (*quam plurimi*) like men soaked in wine through drunkenness'. Gildas nevertheless supplies his own correction:—'Perhaps some one will say: All bishops or presbyters are not so wicked as they have been described in the former part. . . . Neither do I strongly deny this' (c. 66). He acknowledges that many are 'chaste and good',

that they have acquired the 'apostolic throne' in the legitimate way (*legitime*), being well able to confer spiritual gifts (c. 92). But his complaint against these last reveals to us the real Gildas far more truly than his terrible denunciations of the wicked; they are not heroic, he maintains, they should be made of sterner stuff, and his soul is grieved that these 'good' bishops and presbyters are not awake to the awful call of the time. The enemy of the future is the present, and even 'good' men may not be alive to the grave and urgent issues of their day. Monachism now applied itself in its own new way to meet the needs of a Church, apparently well supplied with that ordinary form of ministry which had, long before this time, and everywhere, reached the final point in its evolution, namely, a threefold division into bishop, presbyter, and deacon.

But monachism's call to the Church was not new in 540, for a certain Riocatus was 'bishop and monk' in Britain some seventy years earlier, and traces of a still older monachism have been reviewed. But the time has now been reached when its progress was quickened and more keenly appreciated, and its practical call to self-sacrifice and to stern self-discipline was finding wide and voluntary response. The movement may well be called practical, as it was easily understood and easily grasped by men in general. Whether monachism was, after all, too narrow in its compass for real spiritual progress is a legitimate question, but outside the scope of this work. The fact, however, is beyond dispute that monachism now became, and for a long time remained, a very real and the most prominent feature of the religious life of Britain. It is here that the task of the present writer lies.

Yet amid the licence and disorder described by Gildas, the episcopate was important enough to be the object of the highest ambition, and may well have permanently maintained its position in the government of the Church in spite of the rise of a powerful monachism in its very midst. The British episcopate, in fact, continued its functional and official status as the pastorate of souls.

Many of the charters in the *Book of Llandâv*, and the

records of the twenty-one Synods it contains, all ending in gifts to Llandâv, show that three abbots came to form an integral part of the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. Their monasteries were called by the names of the several founders; the three, it has been previously remarked, were Abbas Ilduti, Abbas Catmaili (Catoci), and Abbas Docguinni (Dochou), i.e. the Abbots of Lann Ildut, Lann Carvan, and Lann Doche.

Many others appear in Glamorgan itself, as, for instance, Teilo (*Monasterium s. Teliau*), Bolgros, Lann Dewi, Lanndougarth, Lann Garthbeuni, Lann Guorboe (p. 164), Gwentonia Urbs, Lann Enniaun (Lann Oudocui, pp. 222, 223). Lann Cors, Lann Berugall, Lann Cingual.

There exists no chartulary such as this of Llandâv for other parts, so that any names that can be brought forward in this connexion are of necessity few, though the monasteries, small or large, were everywhere numerous. When Mynyw or Kilminui (*ecclesia Minuensis*), Llanbadarn, Bangor (in Cardiganshire), and some other place where Maelgwn, as Gildas reminds him, had been monk, have been mentioned, it must not be supposed that all have been enumerated. The fact that the records have perished, especially in North Wales with respect to Cybi, Deiniol of Bangor, and the important island of Enlli (Bardsey), has caused the historian's knowledge to be far scantier than he could desire. A crowd of other names has certainly been for ever obliterated. Yet the multiplicity of *llans*, where the eremites built their cells, still remains as a vivid testimony of the spirit which swept over the Church of our fathers from the forties of the sixth century onward, until after important changes their Church, yielding obedience to Rome, was displaced, along with her institutions, and caused to disappear by mediaeval Catholicism.

Before the middle of the sixth century indigenous monachism existed in Britain; the consensus of tradition makes it probable that certain representative men of and within the movement were contemporaries. Of these were Teilo, Catog, Padarn, Samson, David, Gildas, Dochou, and Daniel of Bangor. Their actual predecessors, generally

spoken of as 'teachers', were, among others, Dubricius, Illtud, and 'Poulinus',[1] who is also said to have been a 'disciple of St. Germanus'. The late authorship of the Life of Teilo has been already adverted to; the same fact has to be kept in mind in reference to the Life of Catog, which is later than Howel vab Owen, King of Glamorgan in the eleventh century.[2] Whether we accept the compromising incident related of Arthur or not, the *Vita* brings David, Teilo and Dochou on the scene as friends and contemporaries not only of Catog, but also of Mailgunus (Maelgwn), King of Gwenedota or Gwynedd. It will, consequently, not be very erroneous to think of Teilo, Catog, David and the rest as active in their monastic life before and after A.D. 550.

Teilo's oldest attestation lies in the fact that the monastery and church at Llandâv is called by his name, that is, simply 'Saint Teilo'. The pilgrimage of the three, Teilo, David and Padarn, to Jerusalem and their consecration there must be pure fable. But the Bishop of Llandâv is afterwards called 'Bishop of Teilo' (escop Teliau), just as *abbas Ilduti* stands for the Abbot of Llanilltud, and 'Llyfr Teilo' is the name for that well-known copy of the Gospels which had once belonged to the church of Teliau or Teilo.

A Privilegium granted to Llandâv is preserved, of which a British, or Welsh, version is added to the Latin, and deserves notice. Purporting to be of the sixth century, it translates 'Privilegium sancti Teliaui et ecclesiae suae Landauiae' by 'Lymma y cymreith ha bryein eccluys Teliau o Lanntaf'. Thus the 'Privilege of St. Teilo and his Church at Llandâv' is rendered 'This is the law and privilege of the Church of Teilo of Llandâv'. Further on the British reads 'dy (y=i) escop Teliau', for which the Latin is 'episcopo sancti Teliavi', i.e. to the Bishop of St. Teilo. The language may be considerably older than the tenth or eleventh century, but the real age of the document is

[1] The text of the *Book of Llandâv* has *Poulinus*.

[2] *Brut y Tywysogion* names Howel uab Etuin brenhin Gwlat Forgan about 1040, who may be the same person as is indicated in the words 'tempus Hiuguel regis, filii Ougueni regis Morganensium' of c. 4 in the Life of Catog.

rendered uncertain by the words 'o audurdaut papou Rumein', i. e. by the authority of the Popes of Rome, which is the translation of the Latin 'confirmatum apostolica auctoritate'.[1]

This implication of papal authority may have been inserted by the compiler of the volume, in the belief that it added to the security of the grant. The Welsh version is of the same antique form as the Welsh of the boundaries, which appears in all the charters down to the time of Bishop Herewald, whose death took place in 1104. It may be, however, that there was an older document, or several, as the previous paragraph asserts; still in any case Dubricius is not to be connected with the founding of Llandâv. That work must be attributed to Teilo, a man of the new period of monachism, the monastery deriving its name from the river, the monastic church Teliau from its builder and first pastor.

If the account given in the Life is accepted, he was, at the same time as Samson, a disciple of Dubricius, and afterwards, along with David, of Paulinus. In time, it is said, he became Bishop of Llandâv, succeeding Dubricius and, like him, archbishop 'over all the Churches in the whole of South Britain'. These attributions of metropolitan powers to Bangor in Gwynedd, to Llandâv by some documents, to Menevia by others, and by Geoffrey of Monmouth to Caerlleon-on-Usk, must be put aside as purely legendary.[2]

[1] *Book of Llandâv*, pp. 118-20. The paragraph following the Privilegium begins: 'Statutum est enim apostolica auctoritate istius ecclesiae privilegium.'

[2] The following assertions are made by contemporary writers. Of Dubricius: 'Super omnes autem Britannos dextralis partis Britannie beatum Dubricium summum doctorem a rege et ab omni parrochia electum archiepiscopum consecrauerunt,' that is, Germanus and Lupus (*Book of Ll.*, p. 69). Of Teilo: 'Principatum tenens super omnes ecclesias totius dextralis Brittanie,' ibid. p. 115. Of David: 'Deinde omnium ore benedictus atque magnificatus, cunctorum consensu episcoporum, regum, principum, optimatum, et omnium ordinum tocius Britannice gentis, archiepiscopus constituitur, nec non civitas eius tocius patrie metropolis, dedicatur ita ut quicunque eam regeret archiepiscopus haberetur,' Rees, *C. Br. Saints*, p. 139; and Giraldus Cambrensis speaks

Such advanced ideas belong to the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when, with the aid of Norman power, the authority of Rome was being forced on the Britons.[1] The strange assertions to which reference has just been made, respecting archbishops at Llandâv, Mynyw, Caerlleon, and Bangor, are in all probability protests against submission to the Archbishop of Canterbury. They grasped at a fiction of the past, and the idle boast of their possession of native archbishops of their ancient Church was the last faint echo of the national reluctance to accept the inevitable on the part of those who regarded themselves as the sole heirs of Britain's glorious past.

To the period of the revival of monachism also belongs Catog or Catwg, though his life appears to have been somewhat more isolated than were those of the others who have been mentioned. When the confusion of an ancient epoch, the contradictory records of which are derived from little beyond vague tradition, is taken into account, any hypothesis that several persons bore this name can only be received with the greatest hesitation. There is one *Vita S. Catoci* which may have gathered up all that was believed respecting Catog at the time it was written. Other accretions were added afterwards to the earlier strata of the story as told in this *Vita*. Though this Life, by its own confession, is, in that part at least, later than the middle of the eleventh century, yet it may be true that Catog was, as it states, the son of Gundleus, a prince in that part of Demetia, and that his mother was Gladusa, the daughter, it is said, of another prince, Brychan of Talgarth.

words to the same effect. *Brut y Tywysogion* calls Elfod 'archesgob Gwynedd'; *Annales Cambriae*, 809, 'Elbodg archiepiscopus Guenedote regionis migravit ad Dominum.'

[1] The words of Giraldus Cambrensis are significant; he can say, writing in 1203, that 'before the times of the last three bishops the Church of Menevia was the primatial see of the whole of Wales'. These three were Normans, viz. Bernard, David Fitzgerald, and Peter de Leia, the time of whose rule extended from 1115 to 1198. 'Their desire is,' he bitterly complains, 'to rule not to benefit us -*praesse quidem nobis et non prodesse cupientes*' (Giraldus's *Works*, Rolls Series, vol. iii: *Prologues to Langton*; also Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i, p. 431).

The Irish eremite Meuthius, who baptized Catog, was his first teacher. Tathai is mentioned in a conflicting manner. Afterwards, leaving a monastery and a host of disciples, Catog set sail for Ireland to profit by the learning of that island—a very unlikely thing to do at that time.[1] On his return he found other teachers, one, named Bachan, lately come from Italy. Lancarvan was built afresh; it was also called Nantcarvan, as the same chapter (IX) asserts, possibly the older name the place had before a *llan* was founded there. We are told of relations with David and especially with Gildas,[2] with Arthur and Maelgwn; of three pilgrimages to Jerusalem and seven to Rome, 'made for the benefit of the souls of his parents and companions.' At last a cloud carried him far away to Benevento (possibly Banwen), where he became abbot and bishop.

Llangarvan, probably a generation later than Llanilltud, must have been a place of great consequence in the furtherance of the quickened religious life of the country far and near, but also as a school of monachism where many were trained in the learning of the age.

An interesting conjecture has of late found some favour. The *Myvyrian Archaeology* contains, among other early monuments of the British or Welsh language, fifty-seven double-columned pages (in Gee's edition, 1870) of 'The Wisdom of Catog the Wise'—Doethineb Catwg Ddoeth. What is here attributed to Catog, it has been held, is really to be regarded as the so-called *Catonis Disticha*. The latter work is a remarkable collection of poetic verses in four books; the verses give moral counsel of a very striking character, and were largely quoted for centuries, among others by the Christian poet Commodian in the fourth century. The unknown author may have been a heathen of the same type as Ausonius, and, in time, anterior to Constantine.[3] The *Wisdom of Catwg*, or 'Y Gwyddfardd

[1] Such visits to Ireland are a common feature of later hagiography.

[2] The incidents of the bell curiously wrought by Gildas, and of the Gospel (Evangelium), that is, our four in one volume, written by him, are related in cc. 23 and 29.

[3] The exact date is unknown. My copy is that edited by Fred. Hauthal, Berolini, 1869, *Catonis Philosophi Liber*.

Cyfarwydd a gant Catwg Ddoeth', is, on the other hand, intensely Christian, though non-monastic, and consists of moral maxims in the form chiefly of proverbs and triads, both prose and verse. These are not the *Catonis Disticha*. Some of the sayings, many in fact, are of great beauty and force, but the matter and language prevent their being regarded as the work of Catog or of his age.[1] The ease with which some have been led to such a view is not unnatural, as the desire is strong for some memorial and tangible expression of the beliefs, feelings, and morals prevailing in men of the past for whom tradition had preserved a deep reverence. Catog was called the Wise; this collection of moral sayings teems with wisdom; not unnaturally, therefore, Catog and the verses were connected, because the age was uncritical, allowing itself, not in this island only, but everywhere, to be easily deceived.[2]

South Wales was pre-eminently the land of saints at this period. It may be, however, that this apparent pre-eminence is due, as has been previously suggested, to the loss of records in other parts. Nennius, describing in the Prologue his difficulties, complains of the lack of authorities for his work. He draws on Irish and Saxon annals, also on 'the traditions of our people', yet 'what many learned men and copyists have attempted in writing they have, by some reason or other, left in a very difficult state, maybe because of frequent plagues or the many injuries of wars'. The long

[1] A specimen of the sayings may be taken from the first page; all end in *-en*:—

'Y daith ni fydd pellach er gwrandaw offeren.
Nid prinach fydd heiniar er rhoddi elusen.
Nid llawnach yr enaid er trallenwi Rhumen.
Nid clodfawr y gardod o'i rhoddi'n aflawen.'

Not longer the journey though mass be heard.
The harvest is not less by giving of alms.
The soul is not more full by excessive filling of Rome.
Charity is not praiseworthy when ungraciously given.

[2] One is inclined to hope, and somewhat strongly to believe, that the absurdities of cc. 42-43. on the Genealogies, were not written by the biographer; cc. 45-66 form a kind of chartulary, a record of gifts. The *Vita* proper ends with c. 41.

history of the constant destruction, even demolition by fire and otherwise, of churches and monasteries during the wars with the Saxons, and, afterwards, in those wars recorded in *Brut y Tywysogion* as having been waged by native chief after chief, can only leave the historian astonished that anything at all has escaped. Ireland had not to undergo such a war against a foreign enemy, which may account for the fine mass of literature, Latin and Irish, that has been preserved. Many copies also travelled with and after Columbanus to Continental monasteries. One cannot but be thankful that a few of the immigrants to Brittany have left written records of their times.

Four of those who formed the second generation of ascetics in Britain stand out prominently. They were all disciples of Illtud at Llanilltud, three of them—Samson, Paul Aurelian, and Gildas—joined their countrymen across the sea. The fourth was David of Mynyw, or 'as the common people—so says Giraldus—called him', and as he is still called in his native tongue, Dewi Sant.[1] To these leaders, and the many disciples who followed them, a quickening spirit seems to have come, attracting them to aspirations beyond, and nobler than those of monachism itself, in which the man of seclusion obeyed a call to be also a public preacher among the people, a teacher of doctrine, and a reformer of morals. With a more serious sense of sin they demanded stricter rules of observance, 'the medicine of penance,' and amendment of life. The monk *as monk* became changed, the pastor of souls was born in him, and his spiritual aims were elevated. He became at once bishop or presbyter and preacher, as well as monk.

[1] These four are treated separately in the next chapter.

EXCURSUS E

The following pieces are placed together here because of their bearing on both the preceding and following chapters:—

Catalogue of Irish Saints. This anonymous catalogue is printed in Ussher's *Antiquities* (ed. 1687), pp. 473–4; also, from a different MS., in Fleming's *Collectanea Sacra*, pp. 420–1. As an approximate date, *c.* 730 is given.

Incipit Catalogus Sanctorum Hiberniae secundum diversa tempora.

Primus Ordo. A.D. 432–544.

Primus Ordo Catholicorum sanctorum erat in tempore Patricii. Et tunc erant episcopi omnes clari et sancti et Spiritu Sancto pleni CCCL numero ecclesiarum fundatores. Unum caput Christum et unum ducem Patricium habebant; unam missam, unam celebrationem, unam tonsuram ab aure usque ad aurem sufferebant. Unum Pascha, quarta decima luna, post aequinoctium vernale celebrabant, etc.

Secundus Ordo. A.D. 544–59.

Secundus ordo Catholicorum presbyterorum. In hoc enim ordine pauci erant episcopi, et multi presbyteri, numero CCC. Unum caput Dominum nostrum habebant, diversas missas celebrabant et diversas regulas, unum Pascha quarta decima luna post aequinoctium, unam tonsuram ab aure ad aurem; abnegabant mulierum administrationem, separantes eas a monasteriis. Hic ordo per quaterna adhuc regna duravit, hoc est ab extremis Tuathail et per totum Diarmata regis regnum, et duorum Muredaig nepotum et Aido filii Ainmerech. A Davide episcopo et Gilta (Gilda) et a Doco Brittonibus missam acceperunt: quorum nomina haec sunt: duo Finiani, duo Brendani (&c. eighteen more names), et alii multi.

Tertius Ordo. A.D. 544–98.

Tertius Ordo sanctorum erat talis. Erant presbyteri sancti, et pauci episcopi, numero centum, &c.

These dates have been taken from a Paper by Dr. B. MacCarthy in *Transactions of Royal Irish Academy*, November, 1886, pp. 161–2.

Part of the Letter of Columbanus to Pope Gregory the Great. When this letter was written Columbanus was abbot of the monastery which he had founded at Luxeuil (Luxovium). It belongs to one of the years between 595 and 600.

Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Epistolarum tom. iii, pp. 156–60.

Ceterum de episcopis illis quid iudicas interrogo, qui contra canones ordinantur, id est quaestu—Simoniacos et Gildas (MS. Giltas) auctor pestes scripsit (MS. scripsistis): Numquid cum illis communicandum est? . . . Tertio interrogationis loco responde adhuc, quaeso si non

molestum est, quid faciendum est de monachis illis, qui pro Dei intuitu et vitae perfectionis desiderio accensi contra vota venientes primae conversionis loca relinquunt et invitis abbatibus, fervore monachorum cogente, aut laxantur, aut ad deserta fugiunt? Vennianus auctor Gildam (MS. Giltam) de his interrogavit et elegantissime ille rescripsit sed tamen discendi studio semper maior metus accrescit.

Alcuin. Head of the monastic school at York, 766; at the Court of Charles the Great, 790–3.

(*a*) Letter to Ethelheard, Archbishop of Canterbury, from Alcuin, written 793. Printed in *Monumenta Alcuiniana*, Ep. 28, p. 206 (Wattenbach); also in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 476 and 510.

Legitur in libro Gildi Brittonum sapientissimi, quod idem ipsi Brettones propter rapinas et avaritiam principum, propter iniquitatem et iniustitiam iudicum, propter desidiam et pigritiam praedicationis episcoporum, propter luxuriam et malos mores populi patriam perdiderunt.

(*b*) Letter to the clergy and nobles of Kent; written about 797. Jaffé, vol. vi, Ep. 86, p. 371; cp. Ep. 28, p. 206.

Discite Gyldam Brittonem sapientissimum et videte ex quibus causis parentes Brittonum perdiderunt regnum et patriam et considerate vosmet ipsos et in vobis poene similia invenietis.

Extract from the Chartulary of Landevennec in Brittany. *Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Landevennec*, A. de la Borderie. *Vita Sancti Winwaloei*, the founder of the abbey; *Analecta Bollandiana*, vii. 174 ff. This *Cartulaire* was written before A. D. 884.

Britannia insula, de qua stirpis nostrae origo olim, ut vulgo refertur, processit, locorum amoenitate inclita, muris, turribus magnisque quondam aedificiis decorata, haec magnam habuisse rerum copiam narratur, exuberasse pre cunctis quae hinc adiacent terris, frumenti mellis lactisque simul fertilissima, sed non omnino vini ferrax (Bacchus enim non amat frigus), quia vi acquilonis nimia constringitur, haec igitur, tantis enutrita bonis, ut herba tempore florum primo crevit; sed mox ut seges quae nunquam gelu promitur (cito enim caumate exorto omnia nociva quae fruges ruminent emittit) Zesaniam semenque tyrannorum genuit pestiferum, cui soli fecunditas suberat, et Sabrina et Tamen fluvii per plana diffusi sunt per opportuna divisi. Augmentis ubertatis impendebantur. Hinc universae regioni, foedae libidines, idololatria, sacrilegia, furta, adulteria, periuria, homicidia et ceterae vitiorum soboles, quibus omne humanum genus obligari solet, adolevere et ne eius antiqua profundius repetam facinora.

Qui haec plenius scire voluerit, legat sanctum Gyldam, qui de eius situ et habitatione scribens, et eius mira in Christo conversione statimque ritu paene paganico apostatione et divina lugubriter insecuta ultione et eius iterum, ne penitus in favillam et cineres redigeretur, miseratione, multa eius actibus congrua bene et irreprehensibiliter disputat.

Haec autem quondam patria Cyclopum, nunc vero nutrix, ut fertur, tyrannorum, a divinis non inulta, raro [unquam] diu quievit, propter sua peccata flagellis. Aut enim crebris hostium irruptionibus aut civium inter se invicem concussionibus, aut fame peste, gladio morbisque insectata

acerrimis, sed longe ab huius quoque moribus parvam distasse sobolem suam non opinor, quae quondam ratibus ad istam devecta est, citra mare Britannicum, terram, tempore non alio quo gens barbara dudum, aspera in armis, moribus indiscreta Saxonum maternum possedit cespitem. Huic se cara soboles in istum conclusit sinum quo se tuta loco, magnis laboribus fessam, ad oram concessit sine bello quietam, interea miserorum, qui materna incolebant rura, peste foeda repente exorta, catervatim et absque numero et absque sepultura miseranda sternuntur corpora, et hac lue magna ex parte antiqua desolatur patria. Tandemque pauci et multo pauci, qui vix ancipitem effugissent gladium, aut Scoticam quamvis inimicam, aut Belgicam natalem autem propriam linquentes, coacti acriter alienam petivere terram.

From the Book of Llandâv, p. 115, *on Teilo.*

. . . principatum tenens super omnes ecclesias totius dextralis Brittaniae, secundum traditionem patrum qui eum hierosolime consecrauerant sicut predictum est, sed gens citissime creuit quamuis de paucis in magnam multitudinem, et hoc nimirum fiebat, quia iam obediens facta est ad omne sancti edictum, sic sancta ecclesia que multo tempore fuerat dispersa, interueniente Teliauo sanctorum sanctissimo fuit exaltata. Ad quem conuenerunt discipuli qui fuerant beati Dobricii, Iunapeius, Gurmaet, Cynmur, Toulidanc, Juhil, Fidelis, Hismael, Tyfhei, Oudoceuf et multi alii discipuli ut eum moribus et doctrina imitarentur. De quibus Hismaelem consecravit in episcopum mittens illum ad consulendam ecclesiam Mimuensem et iam uiduatam pastore. Nam sanctus David ad dominum migrauerat et multos alios eiusdem ordinis viros similiter sublimavit in episcopium, mittens illos per patriam, dividensque parrochia ubi ad opportunitatem cleri et populi. Cp. p. 71, of Dubricius.

CHAPTER XXII

THE DISCIPLES OF ILLTUD AND OTHERS

Sources, the *Vitae* as described in Chapters xviii, xix.

Gildas. The important period which was ushered in by men who had lived with Illtud will be the clearer if Gildas is dealt with first. More is known of him than of the others. Several writings bearing his name exist. Some are genuine, others, though not genuine, are ascribed to him inasmuch as they are in some indirect way connected with the Gildas of tradition. He is notably one of those monks whose calling was not of the narrowest type. He became revivalist and preacher rather than, or as well as, the contemplative retired ascetic. A popular reverence has throughout the centuries clung to a few of the names that stand out before us in Britain and Brittany. We have many indications that these men, who knew the poor as well as the great, the 'people' in the Church no less than the bishops and priests who ruled it, had grasped the great fact of sin as the supreme evil for men, and had ministered to the deepest need of their souls. Those who know the works of Gildas well will best appreciate this. Their field of action was, no doubt, limited, but they made it fruitful.

The man with whom we are now concerned was called Gildas Albanius. That there were two men bearing this name, called respectively Gildas Albanius and Gildas Badonicus, is an idea that has been almost completely abandoned. Suggested first of all, but only suggested, by Polydore Vergil, it was made a commonplace of literature through the writings of Bale, the Bishop of Ossory in Ireland, and his opponent Pitseus.[1]

[1] Ioannis Balei *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Scriptorum, hoc est Angliae, Cambriae ac Scotiae Summarium.* The first edition was dedicated to Edward VI, 1549; the third appeared in 1559, much augmented. Bale

The *De Excidio Britanniae* of Gildas was first published under the patronage of Dr. Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of London, and edited by Polydore Vergil, in 1525. The editor ventured upon many daring changes and interpolations, yet the book was issued afresh in 1563 and 1567. The second and, in every sense, superior edition appeared in 1568 under the editorship of Josselin, secretary to Archbishop Parker. This small work opened a hitherto closed page of the history of religion in Britain, and began a period of emancipation from the long bondage to Geoffrey of Monmouth. The first blow for this freedom was struck by Polydore Vergil. Then followed the active period of investigation of which Archbishop Parker was the centre, yet the shade of Geoffrey, for long years, haunted the workers.

Gildas was the son of a Northern prince of Arecluta, bearing the name Caw, a personage dissolving, along with his numerous progeny, into shadowy legends connected with Cowlyd, and with Twr Celyn in Anglesey. Gildas was attracted, as his Breton biographer narrates, to Llanilltud, monastery of Illtud, where he was a 'disciple', along with many others, but especially the three named above. Samson and Paul were probably older than he; David was younger. His birth could not have been much earlier than 500, as he was more than three-and-forty years old some time before the death of Maelgwn Gwynedd, which is placed, as has already been stated, about 546.[1]

'In the school of Hildutus, the above-mentioned teacher,' the *Vita S. Gildae* says, 'a great number of the sons of the nobles were taught. The more distinguished among these,

was an extreme, not to say rabid, Protestant. Ioannis Pitsei, Angli S. Theologiae Doctoris, *Relationum Historicarum De Rebus Anglicis Tomus Primus*, Paris, 1619. He places Bale *apud simpliciores Anglos*, as an *haereticus Anglus*, yet digs out much of his own material from his rival's quarry. The two depend largely on John Leland, who is always painstaking, moderate, and attractive. The fact that Leland's work of investigation began shortly after the suppression of the monasteries gave him special opportunities. See the severe criticism of Schoell, *De Eccles. Britonum Scotorumque Historiae Fontibus*, p. 8.

[1] Gildas in some documents is called *Gillas*, and in a few others *Gelasius*.

as much for nobility of origin as for probity of life,' were the four named,[1] 'yet of them, in respect of his wonderful wisdom of mind,' Gildas was the greatest. He grew up a monk, but was also one of those daring souls who will not let the world travel its own easy way. We possess some very striking *Fragments of Lost Letters* by him, and also a *Penitential* that bears his name (though probably belonging to a later generation), a *Lorica*, or charm-song against evil spirits, similar to the *Lorica* of Patrick, but, chiefly, an Address directed to certain cruel and abandoned princes as well as to the bishops or priests of the Church, who together are regarded as causing the ruin of their country. The title given to this Address, intended in reality for a larger public than those to whom it is specially directed, is *De Excidio Britanniae*.[2] The *Ruin of Britain* seems to me often misunderstood. Men have gone to the book in the cool, calm temper of critics, and with dry light find it all aflame with passion, holy indignation, as they often allow, and disdainfully piling strong, perhaps exaggerated statements in long, tiresome, scraggy sentences. They are disappointed, and speak of its ineptitudes, puerilities, ignorance of all outside the Scriptures, and want of judgement, and call him a Jeremiah of the tenth rank. M. J. Loth having gone to him for historical material, and being disappointed, is led by his disappointment to indulge in these expressions. Such an estimate of Gildas seems to me a curiously mistaken one. The historical portions of the work are, in varying degrees, reliable. The parts which at first sight seem mere declamation supply, when closely studied, a knowledge of the literature then current in Britain. By a patient observation of the numerous quotations from Scripture preserved in the work, important changes that

[1] David is somehow not named, but in the Life of Paul Aurelian his name appears along with the others.

[2] Gildas was widely read for some centuries. The Irish Collection of Canons, among a number of distinguished writers, contains a goodly number of quotations from his writings. See Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, p. xxiv. Beda, and other writers of the English Church, made use of Gildas.

had been taking place during the forty odd years the writer had lived, are traceable.

Gildas, it may be inferred, was acquainted with several of the writings of Rufinus and Jerome; he knew the latter's translations of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Lamentations as well as the Prologues to these books; the revised as well as the earlier version of the Latin New Testament he also knew and used. A fuller account is given below (Ch. XXV). Within the limits of his age Gildas may be regarded as a learned man, since in addition to the works just named he shows an acquaintance with the *History* of Eusebius in the translation of Rufinus, the *Historiae* of Orosius, and other Latin works, particularly such as come under his own term, 'Precepts of the Fathers.'

Quite unconsciously he portrays the kind of men already trained, or those whom the generation to come was destined to train, in the numerous monasteries of Britain. He is capable of anger, of scornful anger, towards unworthy rulers and bishops; but what marks his character most distinctively is the disdain he manifests for the half good, the irreproachable ones who have no daring. And joined to these qualities of his there is a strange moderation, which, as the *Fragments* prove, must have carried weight. Writers, such as have been mentioned above, look into his pages seeking matter for history, and turn away in disgust with a depreciative hint that he has nothing but heaps of Scriptural quotations. They are nearly right so far as they go. But in reading all these quotations, the very selection of passages strikes us as exhibiting marked appropriateness, and the power of the prophetic utterances grows upon us. By considering Gildas from this point of view we come to estimate his work as his contemporaries did.

So let the reader have no mind for mean opinions, let him be content with moderate expressions. Where and how did Gildas acquire his familiarity with the Latin text of the Scriptures? Copies of the Gospels had probably come to him, as they came to Ireland, from Lerins. The other books might also have been derived from the same source. In the Tabennesiot monasteries, we have observed, every

monk was expected to commit the whole Psalter and the New Testament to memory. Gildas must have done more. His early days at Llanilltud moulded him into a youth who knew by heart wellnigh the whole Bible. Here an historical fact comes into view.

There were in his time, so to speak, two Bibles—the revision made by Jerome about A.D. 383–95, and the older text to which, in varying forms, the name Old Latin is given. *It was in the latter form that Gildas committed the Scriptures to memory.* Some time before he wrote the *De Excidio*, the new translation of Jerome was introduced as a new version, and was welcomed in Britain with open mind. Gildas used it for long extracts from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, and most if not the whole of the New Testament, contenting himself, probably because as yet no others were available, with Old Latin codices for the remaining books. But, and this is the point to observe, even as to those books, for which in lengthy quotations he used codices of Jerome's version, when he makes a quotation of well-known words, and makes it from memory, he departs from the new version and falls naturally into that of the Old Latin. It was, we infer, in that older form that he had learnt his Bible in the monastery of Illtud, for that was the Bible of the Britons, which held its place longer still in public worship. In the same way most persons now, though well acquainted with the English Revised Version, would frequently *quote* from memory a passage according to the older Authorized Version, especially those whose close acquaintance with their Bible began before 1881.[1] The subject will form part of a more detailed discussion in another chapter (XXV), and may for the present be put aside.

Gildas stands forth as the best known product of British monachism. His name is not so widely familiar to most men as that of St. David (Dewi Sant), still he is *known* better than Dewi can be. In the *De Excidio*, written in the sorrow of his heart to make known, as the *Vita* says,

[1] This feature appears also in quotations of familiar passages by St. Augustine of Hippo. See Burkitt, 'Saint Augustine's Bible and the Itala,' *Journal of Theol. Studies*, Jan. 1910.

'the miseries, the errors, and the ruin of Britain,'[1] also in the extant fragments of letters, which reveal prudence and wise moderation in character, there are certainly materials for forming a more historical estimate of him than of any one of the four. The material for reconstructing Samson's history must be placed next, because his *Vita* is probably the earliest; then the *Vitae* of Paul Aurelian and David.

With the zeal of the ascetic, Gildas travelled far; coming from the Clyde to that island monastery in South Wales, he and David, after their 'discipline' there, for a number of years made the neighbouring tract of country their home and the centre of their strenuous life. By this time his fearless denunciation of princes and of bad and ease-loving prelates had been already issued,[2] and the contemplative character of the monk's life was broken. Several men afterwards known and honoured in Ireland came to him and David at Monui or Kilmuine (Cil Mynyw) to learn the newer way. Dr. Loofs says: 'Unless all the traditions given in the *Lives* of saints are fictions, there can be no doubt that during the sixth century the Irish Church was, in a way, built anew. So great a number of monasteries are said to have been founded then that there appears to have been no corner of Ireland without its monastery. Among the founders of these, some arrived at such a height of excellence that they had with them immense crowds of monks. Such were Finian, Abbot of Clonard in Meath (*Midia*), whose disciple Columba himself is said to have been, and Comgall, Abbot of Bangor in Ulster.'[3] These

[1] *Vita I*: 'Quae ipse sanctus Gildas scripsit de miseriis, et praevaricationibus, et excidio Britanniae.'

[2] It is impossible to accept the common view, though supported by the biography, that the work was written after his retreat to Ruys in Brittany. It is a book of conflict with living men, known to the writer, written amid the storms of public life. They dared not strike him. Craving pardon of those whose life he not only praises, but even prefers to all the wealth of the world, he expresses the desire, if possible, some time before he dies, to be partaker, as a solitary, of the meditative life (*De Excidio*, c. 65; cf. c. 25).

[3] Fr. Loofs, *Antiquae Britonum Scotorumque Ecc'esiae quales fuerunt Mores*, p. 55.

men had been disciples of Gildas and David, and received from them the practices and ideas which ruled their church for many generations.[1] Finian afterwards consulted Gildas upon a question of discipline and received a reply of which Columbanus in his letter to Gregory the Great, about 595–600, makes honourable mention.[2]

Brendan also, on his strange peregrinations, as stated in his *Vita*, sought out Gildas in Britain, remaining with him three days and three nights.[3]

These statements respecting Irish leaders repairing to Britain for instruction, and for the introduction of their teaching into Ireland, lead to the conclusion that in Ireland, Britain, and Brittany there reigned, during the sixth century and afterwards, one spirit and one mind, a unanimity which gave a new impetus and fresh revival to the Christian Church in the three countries. It cannot but be observed particularly that the intercourse existing between Britain and Ireland during the second half of the sixth century was one of peace. This ecclesiastical unity, and with it the political peace, was strengthened by frequency of communion. For Gildas soon after visited Ireland in person, so that he is mentioned along with Finian and Comgall by Columbanus, who tenaciously and everywhere held to the tradition of the ancients (*seniorum traditiones*). Towards the end of his life Gildas was found among the Bretons. This visit to the

[1] Their names are given in the Catalogue of Irish Saints (see Excursus E, end of Ch. XXII). Of the Second Order (A.D. 599–665) it is said: 'a Davide episcopo et *Gilla* et a Doco Britonibus missam acceperunt.' Gillas is, of course, Gildas, and Docus is, not Cadocus, but, probably, a shortened form of Docunni, which is also given as Dochou, now Doche.

[2] 'Vennianus auctor Gildam de his interrogavit, et elegantissime ille rescripsit,' *M. G. H., Epp.* iii, p. 158.

[3] *Vita S. Brendani*, Acta SS. Hib. 113–54, but handier ed. by Bishop Moran, 1872, from the Liber Kilkenniensis: 'Postea navigavit S. Brendanus in perigrinacione ad Brittaniam adivitque sanctissimum senem Gildam, virum sapientissimum in Brittania habitantem cuius fama sanctitatis magna erat . . . s. Brendanus illic mansit tribus diebus et tribus noctibus.' The Annals of Ulster place his death in 512; the Bollandists in 576 or 577, which is more likely.

neighbouring island is placed by the writer of the older *Vita* during the reign of King Ainmire, whose murder is dated by the *Annals of Ulster* as A.D. 568.[1] The Irish king 'sent to St. Gildas, begging him to come to him, and promising that he would obey his instructions, if he came and restored order within his realm'. After his arrival in Ireland and introduction to King Ainmire, Gildas 'went round all the territories of the Hibernians, restored the churches, and instructed the whole body of the clergy in the Catholic faith'. Any one who reads the whole *Vita* must feel that the account, as given in these words, cannot be regarded as exactly historical, yet it may be concluded with certainty that Gildas was in Ireland during the sixties of the sixth century, to the great profit alike of the Church and of the clergy.

Upon his return to his adopted country, he was again a preacher, now a 'preacher from Ireland', as the prophecy of Merlin, the Vaticinium Merlini, in Geoffrey's History calls him. It may be that his ministrations as such were carried on at that very church where the strange incident of his dumbness had formerly occurred on account of the presence of the mother of Dewi Sant, yet unborn. Geoffrey, while evidently wrong in his chronology, seems to have chronicled a genuine tradition respecting the popularity of the *praedicator Hiberniae*. The church may have been the same, that called Canmorva, as Giraldus with his local knowledge calls it.[2]

The biography brings Gildas to Letavia,[3] that is Brittany,

[1] The same information, substantially, is obtained from the Annals of Tigernach, the *Chron. Scotorum*, which gives 569; Annals of Inisfallen, 561; Annals of the Four Masters, 566. Dr. Reeves' Notes in the *Vita S. Columbae*, i. 7, give further information about this Irish king. See also *Revue Celtique*, 1896, p. 148. The Rolls Series edition of *Annales Cambriae* assigns Gildas's visit to 565.

[2] Ussher (*Antiq. Brit.* p. 237) has changed the name to Kair Morva, which would now be Caer Morfa, but Canmorva seems to need no change with its implication of 'near the morfa, or sea marsh'. Giraldus's further description, 'Urbs maritima vel castrum,' it must, however, be acknowledged, suggests *Caer*.

[3] *Letavia*, or, as also found, *Lettau*, is the modern Llydaw, a name carried over from Britain itself, as several others were.

in his thirtieth year, a statement which again makes confusion of chronological order. So early a date is plainly impossible, and the writer falls into a similar confusion when he speaks of a message to Gildas from St. Bridget, whose death is placed in 523. Neither could the *De Excidio* be written in Brittany, as the biographer further asserts. The desire and hope breathed in the work, about thirty years previously, that he should share in the quiet retirement of holy hermits, came to this strenuous worker in the evening of his days, as all accounts place his death in the early seventies. For a time he lived as a solitary on an island in sight of Reuvisium, or, as it is now called, Ruys. Albert le Grand gives a glowing description of the peninsula or island of Ruys in Morbihan Bay, where, after a time, Gildas built his monastery. It might be called, he says, 'a terrestrial paradise,' with its three parishes, in one of which the chapel is even now called Lan Gueltas.[1] Once more, near the river Blavet and with one companion, St. Bieury, he constructed for himself another hermitage. But the instincts of the wandering preacher were strong in him; he is found after this retreat in Cornugallia or Cornouaille, whence many came to bury him, and where there still abound memorials of Gildas and his disciples. Wonderful works were wrought by him some distance away in a forest near the sea, and resulted in the building of a new monastery or an oratorium, 'by the inhabitants called Mount Coetlann, which means the monastery of the Wood.'[2] The *Vita* may, perhaps, be partly mistaken in

[1] *Vies des Saints de la Bretagne Armorique*, 1680. I have used the new edition with notes published in 1901.

[2] *Vita I*, c. 27, 'Quod incolae vocant mons Coetlann, quod sonat interpretatum monasterium nemoris.' At the time when the biographer wrote, or in the older document used by him, *lann*, we observe, meant monastery: Zimmer says he ought to have translated Coetlann, not 'monastery of the wood,' but 'the wood of the monastery'. The use of the word 'mountain' along with the fact that the neighbouring bay of the sea is called *Baie de la Forêt* leads one to conclude that in this case they are both wrong: with the meaning given by the biographer the name would be Lancoet, found as Llangoed in modern names; in Dr. Zimmer's interpretation of the Latin, *lann* leads to quite another meaning,

this interpretation, since Mount Coetlan means 'Wooded Hill', yet his narrative allows us a glimpse of the never wearied Gildas away from his home at Ruys.

His death took place on January 29, for which the only authority is the *Vita*, but the date may have been carefully preserved.[1] The year is doubtful, our *Annales Cambriae* stating simply: '570 *Gildas obiit.*' The year arrived at by Mr. Alfred Anscombe (554) seems much too early.

Samson. The lengthy space allotted to Gildas, regarded as a type of the monk, abbot, and teacher in the second half of the sixth century, renders it necessary to treat of the others within very moderate limits. It appears, if we follow more particularly the biography which we call *Vita I*, that Samson was a child for whom his father and mother had prayed, and had even ventured to consult a magician, a proceeding in which the biographer evidently sees nothing wrong. Such a child must be dedicated to God. His father Ammon, a man of Demetia, and his mother, a woman

that of any occupied space, as found in *yd-lan*, *per-llan*, &c., so that Coetlann may certainly be taken as denoting a wooded area or forest.

> Bwrlymu mae'r ffynon, a llonydd yw'r llyn,
> A minnau a grwydraf i *goedlan* y glyn.
>
> The well springs up, the lake is quiet,
> And I shall wander to the woodland of the valley.

It is possible that 'mons' may have arisen from a contraction for 'monasterium'. 'Coetlann' would then answer to 'nemoris'. On Lancoit see *Book of Llandâv*, p. 32.

[1] c. 30 'reddidit spiritum quarto Kalendas Februarii senex et plenus dierum.' A very elaborate attempt to fix the year of his death is made by Mr. Alfred Anscombe in a pamphlet entitled *St. Gildas of Ruys and the Irish Regal Chronology of the Sixth Century* (1898). He places 'the discovery of the vessel containing the body of Gildas of Ruys on Rogation Monday, May 11, A.D. 554'. We have here a reference to what the writer of the Life says of the sinking of the ship carrying the body from an island, owing to a contention that arose among his disciples—those from Cornouaille and those of Ruys—for the possession of his body. Its miraculous hiding-place, however, was duly revealed, after 'the space of three months', to one of the monks of Ruys. The ship was found safe in a creek near a small oratory to which the biographer gives the significant name Croest (= Croesti, that is, Croesdy), during the Rogation days. With Mr. Anscombe's conclusion, based on all these and other details, the death of Gildas would be fixed on January 29, A.D. 554.

of Gwent, brought him to Illtud to be trained as a monk. The monastery of Llanilltud was on an island, and one of the *Vitae* gives it the name of Pyrus,[1] adding that it was in the neighbourhood of Demetia or Dyfed. But in the *Vita Samsonis*, the somewhat differing information is given that not far from the monastery of Illtud there was 'a certain island lately founded by a noted person and presbyter named Pirus'.[2] Thus a small monastery or a recluse-cell could be itself called an 'island', *insula*, or, in the British language, *inis*. To this monastery, or *inis*, of Pirus, after making wonderful progress at Llanilltud, not simply in learning, but also in willing devotion to all ascetic fasts, prayers, vigils, and self-denial, Samson was attracted by the new spirit of unrest which was beginning to work in him. After a visit paid to his parents, they and his five brothers, his uncle Umbraphel and aunt Afrella were persuaded by him to embrace the religious life, to build churches, found monasteries, and revere priests. Some were sent to distant parts of Ireland, others elsewhere, and, alike for his uncle and for all, Samson had one supreme message: 'Tu frater Umbraphel, peregrinus esse debes,' 'Thou must be a pilgrim'; by this call he himself was stirred and constrained. Returning to his monastery he found Pirus dead, having lost his way by night, one is sorry to read in the honest narrative, through drunkenness. Though elected abbot by all the brethren, Samson did not hold the office for more than eighteen months. Being visited by certain Irishmen who had come from Rome he decided to accompany them home and visit Ireland. After his return, upon discovering an old castle near the river Severn, he spent some time there with his brethren, but still continually supplicated God that He would show him some cave where he could live his life in perfect loneliness. Such a cave he found, and there with joy Samson hid himself. But he

[1] 'Erat autem quaedam insula Pyrus nomine. Demetiarum patriae in finibus sita,' *V. Pauli Leon. Anal. Boll.* i, p. 213.

[2] 'Erat autem non longe ab hoc monasterio insula quaedam nuper fundata a quodam egregio viro ac sancto presbytero, nomine Piro.' There is, apparently, some slight confusion between these two extracts.

was sorely missed from his customary place when the crowds came together on the Lord's day to be present at the celebration of Holy Communion. Consternation filled all. The grotto, however, was discovered, and the reluctant saint was brought back to the monastery where the church was. With great gladness they beheld his face; it was the face of an angel. The biographer here adds a piece of interesting tradition: he has heard or read (*ut aiunt*) that this monastery had been constructed by Germanus.[1] If this be so, then Germanus must have travelled westwards, as far, at least, as the Severn, and the monastery had been in existence for about a hundred years. The whole narrative is quite self-consistent. We also learn the probable fact that Samson preached to the people in their own tongue.

But the restlessness I have spoken of was in the soul of Samson. His consecration to the episcopate soon followed: he was made third along with the other two whom Bishop Dubricius had brought with him, thus following, the biographer asserts, an ancient custom.[2] For the prevalence of such a custom in Britain no other evidence is found than the case of Samson, and the statement, like the supernatural indications of his election to the office of bishop given by heaven itself, is probably due to the distorting influence of legendary tradition.

[1] 'Quod, ut aiunt, a sancto Germano fuerat constructum.' It is called a *locus*, in the enclosure of which the brethren had built an oratorium, or chapel, as would be said now, which Samson frequented every Sunday: 'ad missam celebrandam, et ad Christi communionem percipiendam veniebat.'

[2] It is certainly stated in the narrative that the custom was in some way British (*ut mos ibi est*), yet it is difficult to believe what is said by most writers about it. 'Et cum venissent episcopi qui ad ordinandum veniebant, duos ad ordinandum deferentes secum, tertium secundum morem antiquitus traditum ordinare volentes; sed quis adhuc esset ignorantes,—ut mos ibi est a tribus episcopis tres ordinari.' I quote from the *Analecta Bollandiana* Life. The statement as to its being a custom 'there' seems to be due to a popular error communicated to the writer on the spot, when he came over to visit Britain, and created by the miraculous appearance of the fire and heavenly dove, that 'prodige classique', as has been said, resting on the head of Samson, the latest and third consecrand.

Soon after he was informed by an angel that he was destined to be a pilgrim, and bishop of a place beyond the sea. After consecrating churches built by members of his own family, he sailed across the Severn to Dumnonia. There he found a monastery called Dochou and an interesting character in a wise monk whose name was Uiniaus.[1] Advancing on his way he saw a *maenhir* (*lapidem stantem*), around which in the days of heathenism, long gone by, the inhabitants were wont to dance in pagan fashion, and even in Samson's day, although the people had been baptized, the ancient festive play and dance continued. Samson disapproved of these festivities, caused the people to be rebaptized, and inscribed the sign of the cross on the tall stone. Many of these *maenhirs* (*meini hirion*), I am told, still show the sacred sign which signified the removal of the reproach of heathenism. The place in which this incident occurred, and which the biographer visited in person afterwards, is called *Pagus Tricurium*.

From Dumnonia Samson sailed for the land of his pilgrimage, settling at Dol in that northern part of Brittany which, in remembrance of the old home of the early settlers, also bore the name Dumnonia. To his left as he looked north, he would see Aleth, the present St. Malo, where, somewhat later, Maclovius or Malo was bishop, having come from Gwent. Another neighbour from the same district of Gwent was Meven.[2] There were several other Britons.

It is by no means easy to explain the way in which twelfth-century writers represent the career of Samson. In Geoffrey of Monmouth's account he is made Archbishop of York by Arthur, at the time when the 'metropolitan see' of Caerlleon (*Urbs Legionum*) is conferred on Dubricius. It was after this, according to Geoffrey, that he left for Dol.[3] According to Giraldus Cambrensis he became Archbishop of Menevia

[1] *Uinians, Uinains, Winnavius* are forms found with the explanation that *in ipsa lingua Britannica Lux vocabatur*, i.e. Gwyn, or, perhaps, Gwinneu.

[2] *Vita S. Maclovii vel Machuti: Vita S. Mevenni vel Maiani*, Plaine, *Anal. Boll.* iii. 142 ff.

[3] *Hist. Regum Brit.* vii. 12; ix. 15.

(though it is very strange to find him described as twenty-fifth archbishop from St. David[1]), and carried over with him to Dol the metropolitan pallium which previously belonged to Menevia. It is in this way that Giraldus seeks to explain the non-existence of the archiepiscopal *symbol* at St. Davids in his own time and previously. 'The Welsh prelates,' he says, 'were always consecrated by the bishops of St. Davids, and they in like manner by their suffragans, without fealty or submission to any other Church.' Incongruously also, after such a statement, Samson is placed by him in the second half of the ninth century.[2]

Paulus Aurelianus. The third disciple of Illtud to be mentioned bears a purely Latin name. We find the same feature in a great number of the names that have survived in Christian inscriptions. It thus appears evident that many of the old Roman officials, like Gildas's Ambrosius Aurelianus, lived out their lives in Britain, keeping their own Latin names, and were as a rule Christians. This Paul, an Aurelianus like Ambrosius before him, was born at Penychen in Glamorgan, between Cardiff and Neath,[3] about the same time as Gildas. After leaving Llanilltud with the example of Antony in his mind,[4] he retreats to a desert place near his father's lands, and leads there the life of a recluse. It was there he was ordained presbyter. His evangelizing work, together with that of the twelve presbyters who co-operated with him, spread far and wide, and was especially successful at a place 'called in their language Caer Banhead'. He was in this like the others

[1] *Itiner.* ii. 1.

[2] 'Sederunt autem a tempore David, successivis temporum curriculis archiepiscopi ibidem viginti quinque, quorum haec nomina: David, Eliud, qui et Thelian vocatur . . . Sampson,' *Vita S. Davidis*, App. iii, p. 102.

[3] Cantref Pennychen in *Bruts*, p. 412; in *Book of Llandâv*, Penn ichen and Penn echen. The *Vita* has Penn Ohen, that is, Penn Ochen, explaining it as Caput Boum. Not infrequently in MSS. *h* stands for *ch*.

[4] *Vita*, c. 17 'exemplo illius eximii patris Antonii.' He follows also Mary in preference to Martha, i. e. the contemplative in preference to the practical life. And here the biographer has that suggestive reading referred to, quite unique in Latin texts: 'Paucis vero opus est, aut etiam uno,' but adopted from Greek MSS. by all the latest editors.

who had learnt of Illtud, and like them also his soul was bent on abandoning his native soil for a country where he could be a sojourner on earth. Accompanied by his fellow presbyters, whose names are given, and by a great number of laics, he crossed over to the island of Ushant, and afterwards came to where his *llan* was built in the *plou* of Telmedovia (cc. 11, 12). It was called Lanna Pauli, or, as it is now named, Lampaul. After that, however, his long and final place of abode was in the Pagus Leonensis,[1] where he becomes Bishop of Léon, the place called to-day Saint-Pol-de-Léon. The name *Léon* must itself have been imported from Britain, as there had never been any *legiones* in Finisterre to give the name.

David. This, in the British form of Dewi, is probably the best-known name among those of all ecclesiastics of ancient times in Britain. Yet all that may be regarded as even an approach to a real knowledge of his life and history must be traced back to a single Life written by a bishop of St. Davids at the end of the eleventh century, Ricemarchus, of whom and of his father, who preceded him as bishop, the *Bruts* speak in terms of the highest estimation. A man of this character might be expected to use all the materials with which his father's library and local tradition could furnish him for the writing of this biography. He himself mentions ancient writings, some even in David's own hand. Though the work is called a biography, it is really a sermon or an address to be read during the service when the Saint's day was celebrated year by year.

Ricemarchus, or Rychmarch, as the *Brut* calls him, was one of four sons born to Sulien, and Bishop of St. Davids for nineteen years. Of the father it is stated in *Brut y Tywysogion* that he was Bishop of Mynyw between 1062 and 1073, that for a time he resigned the see in favour of Abraham (*y Vraham*), but returned to it after Abraham's death. A Latin poem by Ieuan or John, the youngest son, further describes his father as a great scholar, who had sought his education in Ireland and Scotland.[2] He was

[1] Pagus = region in the Breton tongue is *pou*, in Welsh it is *pau*.

[2] *Bruts*, Evans's edition, p. 270. The Latin poem of Ieuan (John) on

eighty years of age when he died, 'wisest of Britons, pre-eminent in his religious life, and famous for the scholarship of his disciples and the learning of the congregations.' The same work informs us that 'Rychmarch the wise, son of Bishop Sulien, died in this year' (i. e. 1096–7), 'the wisest of the wise among the Britons, in his forty-third year . . . his education being due solely to his own father'.[1] It is to such a man, that is to the Life written by him, that we owe what is known of Dewi Sant. Yet mention should be made also of the fact that a short notice of him appears in the Life of Paul Aurelian, written, maybe, some two centuries or more earlier than Ricemarchus. Quite a library of books might be named which treat of St. David, Welsh poems of the Middle Ages, mediaeval Latin biographies, and monographs in different languages, yet all, except when new fictions are introduced, seem to have simply this one original source. Giraldus Cambrensis[2] wrote a Life of St. David, but it is only Rychmarch's book in better style, and with a few particulars of place-names added. There is also a *Buchedd Dewi*[3] in Welsh, but this is only a condensed reproduction of the Latin *Vita*, with striking omissions, changes, and

his father, Bishop Sulien, was written on the loose leaves of a copy of the *De Trinitate* of St. Augustine, transcribed by Ieuan for his father's use. The MS. is now at C.C.C., Cambridge. A sixteenth-century transcript of it was nearly consumed in the fire which happened in the Cotton Library, 1731. The fragments were published by Bishop Burgess, in a small pamphlet, printed at Durham in 1812. Jones and Freeman in their volume on *St. Davids*, p. 267, print the hexameters, though not the whole poem. They are given in full from the Cambridge MS. in vol. i of Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, Appendix D, p. 663 ff. The same John copied the Psalms—the Hieronymian Hebraic Psalter—for his brother Ricemarchus, together with the Martyrology of Jerome, with British insertions, so that Ussher calls it *Mart. Britannicum*, and a Paschal Table. This interesting volume is now in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.

[1] *Bruts*, Evans's edition, pp. 273–4. Rychmarch ddoeth; the name, having regard to the time, one feels is fully justified.

[2] *Works*, vol. iii, p. 377, Rolls Series.

[3] Printed *Cambro-British Saints*, p. 102, from the British Museum MS. Titus D. XXII, and by Prof. J. Morris Jones, *Anecdota Oxoniensia, Llyvyr Agkyr Llandewivreri*, 1346, from Jesus College MS. 119. There are some important variations in matter in the two.

additions, especially at the end, made apparently with the view of securing a more suitable form for a popular sermon on the Saint's day. The miraculous setting throughout does not detract from its value; it is a convention of the time, inherited from of old, enshrining the facts as read and known at St. Davids about A.D. 1090—read, let it be repeated, as well as traditionally believed, because Rychmarch had ancient writings to draw upon.

His father was the son of Ceredic of Ceredigion, by name Sanctus, Sant or Sandde, who, coming to Demetia, there violated a beautiful nun, and she became the mother of Dewi. Her name is given as both Nonnita and Nonn.[1] The child was born in the open air with several miracles to attest his coming greatness. He was baptized by Belvis, the then Bishop of Menevia, at a place to which Giraldus gives the name of Port Cleis (Porth Clais), where a spring of living water burst forth, providing a well for the sacred rite.[2] Hence it is clear from the evidence of Rychmarch, who had special opportunities for knowing, that David was not the first Bishop of St. Davids. Judging from this mention of its bishop,[3] as well as from the story of Gildas's attempt to preach in the church, and from the fact of there being a community of nuns there, Mynyw or Menevia would seem to have possessed an ancient church, and was probably, on account of its position on the coast and proximity to several islands, an early home of monachism. A serious error has, therefore, been committed by making lists of bishops begin with St. David.

David was a dedicated child. His education first at Vetus Rubus,[4] called by the British in Giraldus's time *Hen Meneu*,

[1] The British Life reads: 'Dauyd vab Sant, vab Keredic, vab Kuneda'; the Latin has simply: 'Sanctum regem Ceretice regionis.' The mother is spoken of as *Nonnita virgo* in the Latin, *enw y lleian oed Nonn* in the Welsh.

[2] Giraldus: 'ab Aelveo Munevensium episcopo.'

[3] 'Deinde cum baptizaretur ab Belve Meneviensium episcopo . . .' Giraldus makes a significant change here; it was Aelocus, Bishop of Munster, that baptized David, having just arrived at Menevia from Ireland. The British version mentions no one by name.

[4] '*Vetus Rubus* qui et Kambrice Hen Meneu, Latine vero Vetus Menevia.'

i. e. *Hen Fynyw*, and afterwards under Bishop Paulinus 'on a certain island', to which Giraldus gives the name *Vecta*, was that of a monk and cleric. Illtud is lost sight of in this narrative, yet Paulinus is said to have been, like Illtud, a disciple of Germanus, and, like him, to have had his monastery on an island.[1] The same Paulinus appears in the Life of Teilo as the teacher of Teilo as well as David. 'Having heard,' it says, 'of the fame of a certain wise man Poulinus (*sic*), he visited him, and remained with him a considerable time. By mutual intercourse the passages of Scripture that previously had been hidden from him in mystery, through sane exposition became all understood. There he joined to himself David, a man of the most perfect life. So great affection and grace of the Holy Spirit united these two, that in their actions the two had but one will (idem velle et idem nolle). Behold, beloved brethren, how God so joined two saints on earth, whom He chose to be citizens in heaven hereafter. He chose two so that by two He might choose many. O happy life of two, by which the souls of many were refreshed!'[2] 'Paulinus' may have been a reminiscence of Illtud, or may have been another teacher; Teilo is represented to have been both a disciple of St. Dubricius ('alumnus sancti Dubricii et discipulus'), one of the twenty noted ones under him at Henllan, *and a disciple of Paulinus.* Nevertheless it may be stated that David was certainly at Llanilltud, as the Life of Paul Aurelian and the Life of Illtud[3] demonstrate, and may have spent some time with another teacher nearer home who bore this name Paulinus. Paulinus, however, was a disciple of Germanus according to the Welsh version. One cannot but observe a peculiarity

[1] 'Exinde perrexit ad Paulinum scribam, discipulum sancti Germani episcopi, qui in insula quadam gratam Deo vitam agebat.'

[2] *Book of Llandâv*, p. 99. We see clearly the spirit and influence of St. Augustine here in this *Vita*: the *Vita S. Teliavi*, as the *Vita S. David*, is a sermon.

[3] 'Sanctumque Deuium . . . Atque Samsonem sanctum . . . Necnon et sanctum Gyldam . . .,' *Vita S. Pauli Aurel.* 'Confluebant ad illum scolares plurimi, quorum de numero quattuor iste, Samson videlicet, Paulinus, Gildas et Dewi, studebant,' *Vita S. Iltuti*, c. 11, p. 167 of *Cambro-British Saints.*

that runs through Rychmarch's Life; differing from almost all other British hagiographic writers, he calls the saint *David agius* (ἅγιος), not *sanctus*. In this usage he may be carrying on a survival of the use of the Greek terms in the liturgies and other books brought from South Gaul to Britain, that is, from the monasteries of Marseilles and Lerins.[1]

Leaving Paulinus, at the direction of an angel, David founded twelve monasteries in succession; among these we find Glastonbury and Legminstre monasterium, though the latter is called Llan-llieni, i.e. a nunnery, in the version; from Cedweli he took two 'saints', that is, monks, Boducat and Martiun, as his disciples.[2] Now returning to his old home he settled at *Vetus Rubus*, whence he went to *Rosina Vallis*, called Hodnant by the British, or Glyn Hodnant. *Vetus Rubus* is identified by Giraldus Cambrensis with the Welsh *Hen Meneu*, for which he gives the Latin *Vetus Menevia*, i.e. Old Menevia.[3] But Hen Meneu, or Old Mynyw, now Hen Fynyw, is in Cardiganshire, near the river Aeron, and may have been the birthplace of St. David. His monastery and church, however, were from the first in Pembroke, at the place indicated by the angel, and the older name Meneu, Monui, or Menevia was transferred thither. Irish writers give the name Kilmuine to the place, *Kil* being an appellation of their own which did not survive at St. Davids.

His uncle Gweslianus, or Gweslan, a bishop, accompanied him there to reside henceforth with Dewi as brother and

[1] See Ducange on *agius*, and Caspari's *Quellen* on this and other Greek words as peculiar to South Gaul. Many Greek words are found in Gildas. There is a story of Brendan that he was directed by the custodian of the church of Gildas to sing the mass from a book written in Greek characters ('ecce altare hic et librum Graecis litteris scriptum, et canta in eo sicut abbas noster'). By a miracle Brendan learnt to read Greek in the few minutes allowed him (*Vita S. Brendani*, c. 15).

[2] In the version they are called Boducat a Nailtrum. William of Malmesbury in *De Antiquit. Glastoniensis Eccl.* tells the story of David at Glastonbury (*Gall.* xv. 299).

[3] 'Qui Vetus Rubus dicitur, qui et Kambrice Hen Meneu, Latine vero Vetus Menevia.' He must have felt that there was *some* difficulty about the name since he adds that it is derived from the Irish Muni, meaning *rubus* or bush.

disciple. His other disciples, besides Gweslan, Boducat, and Martiun, were Aidan, also called Maidoc, who afterwards became Bishop of Ferns in Ireland; Eliud, who is no other than Teilo, his former companion when he was with Paulinus; Modomnoc; and Ysmahel or Ismael, who succeeded him as Bishop of Mynyw.[1] They now went to Rosina Vallis, or Glyn Rosin, also called Hodnant. An adventure at the hands of Boia, a heathen Scot or Irishman, and his wife, is told at some length; the similar trials, described in the Life of Teilo as endured at the hands of a Pict who had come *ad Minuensem civitatem*, are probably the result of the same cruel hostility.

David built the monastery which was to become so celebrated (*insigne monasterium*) in Glyn Hodnant, along with Bishop Gweslyn (or Gweslan), and those others who were his first disciples. The biographer here introduces his readers to a picture of 'that rigour of cenobitical purpose' decreed with fervour by the father (abbot), which especially reminds us of some pages in Palladius's *Historia Lausiaca* descriptive of Egyptian monachism, and of John Cassian's *Instituta*, wherein Gallic cloister life of a similar nature is depicted. We are not surprised when he ends this important section with the significant words: 'he imitated the monks of Egypt and led a life similar to theirs—Egyptios monachos imitatus, similem eis duxit vitam.' Thus the ideal life for these ascetics of the crowning period, as seen in the mirror of later tradition, was one that voluntarily submitted itself to the extreme severity which had drawn the wondering eyes of Western Europe to Egypt as to a new Holy Land, a visible home of sanctity. David is said to have lived all his life on bread and water, being called, as Giraldus states, Dewi Ddyvrwr,[2] which is symbolic or figurative of the austerity he practised and taught. His austerity was, however, of a somewhat finer and more ethical kind than that of others described in their *Vitae*, and to this trait may,

[1] *Book of Llandâv*, p. 115; this successor of David is sent there by 'Archbishop' Teilo.

[2] 'Unde de Britannice Dewi Deverur, hoc est, David vir aquaticus, est appellatus.' All this part is omitted in the version.

perhaps, be attributed some part of his mysterious and permanent influence.

Soon, we are told, as the sweet odour of David's high reputation spread there came many disciples to him. Kings and princes, men of the world, abandoned their kingdoms and joined his monastery. Among these is named Constantine, King of Cornwall, who is identified by some writers with the Constantine attacked by Gildas, now become repentant. It is sufficient to point out that the Constantine of Gildas is King of Dumnonia, which could scarcely have been joined to Cornwall at that time.

Many wonderful things are said of David's connexion with Ireland through his disciples Aidan, also called Maydawc Sant, and Scutinus, the same as Scotlanus, whom the version calls Scuthyn and Yscolan. Even if we put aside the legends that speak of Brendan crossing the Irish Sea on a monster, or Barrock, on horseback, these prepare us for the accounts given in Irish Lives of the disciples who came from Ireland. The place is called *Minuensis civitas Minui*, i. e. Mynyw or Menevia, and in the Irish *Vitae*, *Kilmuine*;[1] Ty Dewi, now Ty Ddewi, may be an old name, though its actual appearance was later. David became bishop, we know not how, for it is difficult to accept that account of the journey to Jerusalem with Teilo and Padarn, and his consecration there by the Patriarch. The version omits the whole of this legend, expressly stating by the mouth of Paulinus that he was '*ordained* to be archbishop at Rome'.[2] We are informed that David, at one time, had

[1] Giraldus says: 'Unde et Kil Muni Hibernice adhuc hodie ecclesia Menevensis appellatur,' n. b. '*at this day* it is called Kil Muni'.

We have *Combustio Minui* in *Annales Cambriae* A.D. 810, and *ad civitatem Mineu Sancti David* in the *Vita S. Kebii*.

[2] The *Annales Cambriae* under A.D. 601 has the following:

601. Sinodus Urbis Legion.
Gregorius obiit in Christo (should be 604).
David episcopus Moni Iudeorum [read,
Monui De(met)orum, probably];
obiit is understood of David.

David, in the materials from which this Chronicle was drawn, was *episcopus* as in the materials for the chronicles of Rychmarch.

a strong desire to visit the relics of the apostles Peter and Paul, but remained satisfied with the account of the holy pilgrimage furnished him by Barri, an Irish abbot who, with unwearied steps, had accomplished the task. It is not likely that David was ordained either at Jerusalem or at Rome. He was, however, in some way unknown to us, consecrated Bishop of Mynyw, in succession to some other bishop, and long before that consecration, had been abbot of the monastery there. His predecessor probably did not fill the double office, but David, like others in the English Church, followed the example of St. Martin of Tours. With him, and the men of his generation, there arose a new type of pastors with their own new experiences and new aims, and quite unlike the bishops, whether bad or simply good, against whom Gildas had launched his fierce invectives. Probably David himself was one of 'the brethren' who had so long and solemnly urged Gildas to the task which he, as he says, so reluctantly undertook. The spirit and ideas of a new time were in this Bishop of Menevia; such a one was needed, and God provided him.

We must here digress to consider how Geoffrey has represented David. Turning to Book IX we find that Dubricius was archbishop at Caerleon, and was succeeded by David. Thus David was really Archbishop of Urbs Legionum, not of Menevia. But his death took place at Menevia, within the walls of the monastery he loved 'above all the monasteries of his diocese'.[1] Nevertheless in the prophecy of Merlin, which Geoffrey has included in Book VII, he says: 'Menevia shall be clothed with the pallium of Caerleon, and a preacher of Ireland shall become mute on account of a child in the womb.'[2] The implication here seems to be that as the second statement refers to Dewi, so does the first: the 'metropolitan see' was, therefore, moved from Caerleon to Menevia in the person of Dewi. In the *Book of Llandâv*, on the other hand, the charters referring to that church are signed, '*De clericis:* Archiepiscopus Dubricius, Archiepiscopus Telianus,' &c., signatures which

[1] *Historia*, ix. 13. 15 and xi. 3.

[2] vii. 3.

after Oudoceus became simply 'episcopus', that is, each and all of Llandâv. The idea of Dewi's archiepiscopate at Menevia is accepted (1) by Rychmarch, his biographer, about sixty years earlier than Geoffrey, at the time when the Chapter of St. Davids was struggling against Norman ascendancy, and (2) after him by Giraldus.[1] We can only conclude that these contradictory assertions as to the metropolitan rank, whether of Caerleon or of St. Davids, were pure imaginations, owing their origin, as suggested above, to impatience at, and the natural reaction from, the despotism of the age, as instanced by the gradual encroachment of Canterbury supported by Norman power. They were in the air before Rychmarch, and long before Geoffrey, and before Giraldus, who dreamed of a purely British, or Welsh, archiepiscopacy.

Owing to the recurrence, it is said, of the Pelagian heresy a great council was held at Brevi, the place afterwards called Llanddewivrevi. There were present 118 bishops of Britain, an innumerable multitude of presbyters, abbots, and other orders, of kings, princes, laics, both men and women, so that the concourse appeared like a great army in the field. Of Pelagianism proper there could be no question at this time. Prosper Tiro, writing about 435, pronounced that it was extinct. The present controversy, however, was distinct from that, being purely Gallic in origin, and connected with the so-called semi-Pelagianism, in which Faustus, successively Abbot of Lerins and Bishop of Riez, a man too of British origin, was the protagonist. Of this controversy there might be some lingering echoes at that time in Britain.[2] The bishops in turn tried the task of preaching to the vast multitude, but all in vain; they could not make their voices heard. At last one of the bishops, Paulinus, with whom 'sanctus David pontifex' had at one time read, advised that they should invite the co-operation of 'a man eloquent, full

[1] *Opp.* iii. 47. Vide Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, vol. i, p. 317, A.D. 1125–30. and pp. 395 ff. about St. Davids' claims to metropolitanship.

[2] The controversy extended over a long period in Gaul itself; it is said to end with the Council of Orange in 529, but there were difficulties afterwards.

of grace, approved in religion, companion of an angel, a lovable man, of beautiful countenance, of noble bearing, four cubits tall.' This is the picture the biographer has painted of his hero saint. Among the leaders of this synod[1] were three—Paulinus, Daniel of Bangor, and Dubricius. The two latter were sent as messengers, after a second and third message had failed to draw David from his voluntary retirement. Only after much persuasion did the saint consent to their urgent request. This love of seclusion and reluctance to appear in public may be part of a genuine tradition.

The preacher came. Only a handkerchief was under his feet, placed there by a young lad he had brought back to life on the way. His voice resounded like a trumpet. Naturally the legendary fiction, a stock one, creeps in—as he spoke the ground under him rose to be a hill.[2] By common acclamation and by all ranks of those present, the preacher was 'appointed archbishop of all the people of Britain'.[3] Heresy was cast out, the decrees of Catholic and ecclesiastical rule were confirmed, the country was roused as from a deep sleep. It is in the next passage that the writer gives an intimation of the materials used by him, at least as regards the proceedings in this synod and its results. They consist of very ancient writings and are in part by the hand of the father himself.[4] Such a statement must contain an element of solid truth, especially if we remember the learning of the writer's father, Sulien.

A second synod, 'to which the name Victoria is given,' was held. It renewed and confirmed the decrees of the former synod. 'From these two synods all the churches of our country have received their way (*modum*) and rule by the authority of Rome.'[5] This *Romana auctoritas* was

[1] The British version has *senedd* for *synod*.

[2] The same story is told of Kentigern.

[3] *Vita*, p. 139 'Tocius Britannice gentis archiepiscopus constituatur.' The punctuation, I believe, is not quite correct in Rees's edition.

[4] Ibid. 'Que in vetustissimis patris scriptis sua sancta manu, mandata ex parte inveniuntur.'

[5] Ibid. 'Ex his igitur duabus synodis omnes nostre patrie ecclesie modum et regulam Romana auctoritate acceperunt.'

impossible in Britain at the time when David was active, say A. D. 525–50, but it was an important, we may even say an essential, factor of Church life at the time when Rychmarch and other biographers wrote, when the *Book of Llandâv* was compiled, and when Geoffrey drew up his *Historia*. Hence we find, as stated above, asseverations of that type in these and in not a few other writers.[1] Through fear of changes inaugurated by the Norman conqueror —seemingly about to bring in their train the metropolitan authority of Canterbury—men turned to the idea of papal authorization of their own revered past. A similar situation and aspiration had given rise to all or most of the false Decretals; bishops had sought refuge from powerful metropolitans in the greater authority of the Pope. So it was with these writers in regard to their fathers' ancient Church. For this purpose they created a fable of 'apostolic authority' of which their past afforded no proof.

The passage quoted from the Life is at any rate exceedingly suggestive in one respect. It shows the writer's consciousness that distinctive peculiarities in ecclesiastical life and order existed within the ancient and original Church of Britain, the Church of Dewi Sant. These 'customs of the Fathers' had not been forgotten, and the writer patriotically desired their preservation. Mention is made in the *Annales Cambriae* of a third synod, called the Synod of Urbs Legion, but whether this was Caerlleon-on-Dee or Caerlleon-on-Usk we cannot tell. No information is given of the object for which it met, the record being simply:

'601. Sinodus Urbis Legion.'

On the Kalends of March, after due warning from heaven, this arduous worker, this benefactor of his people, was called away, and, in great peace, gave back his life to God (*vitam Deo reddidit*). The sorrow of all, with their deep cry: 'Who will be our helper? Who will correct and set us up? Who supremely kind as Father David? Who will intercede for us with the Lord?' is described most graphically and with-

[1] Note especially *Book of Llandâv*, pp. 118–20, 246, 252, 266; Geoff. *Historia*, iv. 20.

out undue exaggeration. We feel that we have been reading 'Rychmarch the wise'.[1] We wish, though vainly, that the conventional hagiographical mode had been cast aside, and the writer had described for us the living strength and activity of the religious life which these men had called into existence. We have a glimpse of it in the universal grief which followed the death of St. David, and which was shared not only by monks, bishops, and kings, but by the laity also, men and women alike.[2]

On the authority of the *Annales Cambriae*, the year 601 is generally accepted as the date of St. David's death, but the Chronicle must certainly be pronounced in error in this respect. It places the death of Gildas in 570, and the decease of David could not be thirty-one years later. The Life by Rychmarch gives simply 'Tuesday the Kalends of March' (*tertia feria Kalendas Martii*), and the same statement is made by Giraldus; it was therefore a year in which the first of March fell on a Tuesday, a detail very likely to have been faithfully preserved. Ussher calculates that this must have been A. D. 544.[3] William of Malmesbury gives the year 546, and Geoffrey of Monmouth represents Daniel of Bangor and David as dying some time after Arthur, whose death he places in 542.[4] Teilo, his old friend and fellow disciple, when exercising archiepiscopal rule at Llandâv, sent Ishmael to be Bishop of Menevia 'because Dewi Sant had departed to the Lord'.[5]

[1] It is curious to observe towards the end of the *Vita* the liberties taken in the Welsh version. For instance, the second synod is omitted, passages are interpolated, the *Nunc dimittis* of David is paraphrased, as is also the account of the lament, *Kwynvan*, over his death. It is strange to read *naw radd nef* for *angelica caterva*, with a whole page of new matter added in the most accredited sermon style. Moreover, Rychmarch's interesting paragraphs of reference to himself and his work are omitted.

[2] As showing how widely reverence for St. David was felt, it may be noted that about fifty-three churches are to-day called Llanddewi, some, slightly disguised, in Herefordshire.

[3] 'Qui (Gir. Cambr.) Kalendas Martias quibus ad Dominum migravit David in *tertiam feriam* incidisse innuit, ad annum DXLIV illius obitus fuisset referendus,' *Antiquit.* c. xiv, p. 274 (2nd ed. 1687).

[4] *Historia*, xi. 3.

[5] 'De quibus Hismaelem consecravit in episcopum, mittens illum ad

For the districts further north the material is scarcer than heretofore. There is no evidence of a Church at the important station of Chester, where the Twentieth Legion was quartered for over three centuries, and which after its abandonment as a fortress probably still existed as a town. Yet, judging by analogy from other Roman centres, there must, presumably, have been here the same kind of Church that would show similar readiness to adopt the monastic discipline which by this time prevailed elsewhere. Chester is full of ecclesiastical structures and their remains, but they are all post-Norman. Neither tradition nor ruin goes back to purely British times, when the place was still a *Civitas Legionum* or Caerlegion (Caerlleon).[1] Yet, as has been already intimated, Nennius and British poetry in the vernacular fill the whole land, from North Wales to the Clyde, with memorials which connect the peoples of this region with one another no less in Christian fellowship than in wars and political feuds, while their wars against the English are described as wars against the heathen.

Kentigern, one of these 'men of the north'—Gwyr y Gogledd[2]—called also in the Life by Jocelin *Munghu*, i. e. Mungo, came as an exiled bishop to St. David in Menevia. Moving, however, northwards, he founded a monastery on the river Elwy, where, as at Llandâv on the Taf, at the present day, the name of this river is preserved in the name Llanelwy (St. Asaph). Jocelin, the monk of Furness and author of the *Vita Sancti Kentigerni*, acknowledges his indebtedness to older sources, and the truthfulness of this is proved by his express statement that there was matter in them opposed to sound doctrine and catholic rule. Kentigern was Bishop of Glasghu (Glasgow), having been consecrated somewhat irregularly after the manner of the British and Irish, by one bishop; but with the building of his monastery on

consulendam ecclesiam Minuensem et iam uiduatam pastore. Nam sanctus David ad Dominum migraverat,' *Book of Llandâv*, p. 115.

[1] We bring to mind that British bishops at the Council of Arles came from Roman stations.

[2] See Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, vol. ii, pp. 454–6: 'Bonedd Gwyr y Gogledd, Trioedd Arthur a'i Wyr.'

the Elwy, he also placed there his new episcopal seat, making up by the saintly severity of his life for whatever defect or irregularity there had been in his ordination. So also, in fact, he had done at Glasgow. It should be observed that, as represented by Jocelin, Kentigern constituted himself a local bishop at Llanelwy; there could be as yet no idea of a 'diocesan' bishop, his *diocesis* was, in the old sense, the church at which he ministered. Further, by his action in appointing his beloved disciple Asaph his successor as abbot, and his consecration of him as bishop, he himself repeated that very (British) irregularity upon which Jocelin touches earlier in the Life. The miraculous carrying of live coal in his garment, so often told of others, seems to have determined Kentigern that this youth whom he had ardently loved should be his successor in both offices. It is after him that the see is called St. Asaph's. The monastery appears to have been a flourishing convent, the number of monks reaching even as high as 965, though in the representation of the distribution of work there seem to be some points borrowed from the usage in Benedictine monasteries, as is evidently the case in Beda's narrative respecting Bangor-is-y-Coed. It is not easy to fix the time of Kentigern's sojourn at Llanelwy. Jocelin, whose own date may be as late as *c.* 1185, has introduced some confusing statements into his narrative. If Kentigern is truly represented as spending some time with St. David at Menevia, his flight must be placed before A.D. 544, and the mention of Nantcarban (Llancarvan) might accord with this date, but Jocelin by fixing his age at 187 years is able to bridge over the interval between his early birth and the years which followed the reconquest of Dumbarton by Riderch. The 100 may certainly be cancelled. This leaves the period from about 540 to 573 (when the battle of Arderydd[1] gave victory to the northern Britons, and brought about the recall of Kentigern), an interval roughly of thirty years, during which he may have founded the monastery, and instituted Asaph as second Bishop of Llanelwy or St. Asaph. There must have been

[1] *Annales Cambriae*: '573, Bellum Armterid', that is, Arderydd.

here a centre of definite and enthusiastic religious influence and teaching, perhaps, for the British themselves, of even greater significance than it was in the early years of the post-Norman period.[1]

Daniel of Bangor has been mentioned several times already. The British called him Deiniol or Deinyoel; in the vernacular of to-day he lives as Deinial, though varying with Deiniol. But it is disappointing to feel that so little is really known of this leader of monachism and church rule beyond the fact of his coming from the neighbourhood of Llandâv to Bangor. 'Dubricius,' it is said in the *Book of Llandâv*, 'sent some of his disciples throughout the churches given to him, and for some he built churches, and consecrated bishops over South Britain as helpers for himself, after instituting their *parrochiae*. Daniel he consecrated as bishop in the city (*civitas*) of Bangor, and many others as abbots and presbyters along with the inferior orders. Illtud he appointed abbot at the place called after him, Lannildut.'[2] A later hand has written a marginal note to the following effect: 'Mark the fatherly rule (*regalem* (*sic*) *parentalem*) of St. Dubricius of Llandâv, once archbishop, metropolitan and primate of the whole South of Great Britain, and legate of the apostolic see in the metropolitan city of Llandâv.' This palpable fiction is again repeated with the crude mistake of substituting Teilo for Dubricius. 'Mark here how St. Teliaus consecrated Daniel to be Bishop of Bangor, and how the city of Bangor was subject to the archiepiscopate of Llandâv, also that the Bishop of Bangor was subject to the archiepiscopate of Llandâv; *nota bene*.' All this can be quickly passed over.

Daniel appears in a paragraph which is not quite convincing. It seems to have been written by the compiler of the volume, consequently it is of less historical value than the *Lectiones de Vita Sancti Dubricii*. It must be assumed that

[1] Henry of Huntingdon does not name St. Asaph among the Welsh sees; Giraldus Cambrensis in the itinerary with Archbishop Baldwin (1188) speaks somewhat slightingly of it.

[2] *Book of Llandâv*, 'De primo statu Land. ecclesiae'; et *Vita Archiepiscopi Dubricii*, p. 71; cf. p. 337 for *marginalia*.

the Life of Samson had been used by the writer. It should be observed, however, that Dubricius is nowhere in this narrative called *archiepiscopus*, but *episcopus* only; neither is Llandâv named, and the legend is consequently older than the rise of the fictitious story of an archiepiscopate of Llandâv.[1] I find twenty *scholares* named in this Life—Teilo, Samson, Ubeluius, Merchguinus, &c., all at Henllan—but Daniel is not among them, that is, his name does not appear in the account which we must regard as the older, where neither the archiepiscopate nor Llandâv itself is mentioned. We can hardly regard Daniel as sent to Bangor by Dubricius in the capacity of archbishop; still there is no doubt a kernel of truth within the legend, and we may at least believe that Daniel came to Bangor from South Wales. The very name Bangor—a leading community—itself implies a monastery; there were bishops previously to him. Like Kentigern at Llanelwy, he both ruled a monastery and ministered to the Church as bishop, some short time, we may gather, before or after A.D. 500. The Church seems to have held a commanding position among the communities in North Wales. Moreover, though it is outside the scope of the present volume, it is noteworthy that among its bishops was one who played a prominent part in introducing among his fellow Britons, and gaining their partial acceptance of, the non-British conceptions so fervently and so repeatedly upheld by Beda, who was an Englishman. Elvod was at Bangor a learned bishop of a leading Church, about 800; his disciple Nennius and the Harleian chronicler, if indeed they be not the same person, designate him as 'Archbishop of Gwynedd'. The other archbishops—Dubricius, Teilo, Dewi—are fictions of legend; in *some* sense Elvod was a real one.[2] Yet the term was often applied to any great bishop, simply as being great.[3]

[1] *Book of Llandâv*; the *Lectiones* begin on p. 78, and end, I believe, with 'vitam duxit in melius et finiuit' on p. 83. The rest is the work of the compiler, who makes a quotation from Gildas.

[2] We should compare what one form of *Brut y Tywysogion* has to say respecting the commotion that arose among the bishops in South Wales in consequence of Elvod's action and, as seems, his assumption of this title.

[3] Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, gives several instances of this mark of respect.

There was a wandering star among those luminaries of the early sixth century. The Life of Cybi describes him as the son of a Cornish chieftain (*princeps milicie*) named Solomon or Selyf ab Geraint ab Erbin, who travelled far as a pilgrim in early youth, even as far as Jerusalem, and then settled for twenty-five years with St. Hilary at Poitiers. He was here consecrated bishop, but soon returned to his own country with ten disciples, of whom five are named in the *Vita*. They settled at Ethelicheaun, where the king Ethelic, at first hostile, was reduced to submission by the miracles of Cybi, and extended to them his friendship. In consequence of this reconciliation Ethelic gave to Cybi, bishop and monk, two churches in perpetuity, which were Llangybi (Lankepi) and Llanddaverguir, a statement contrary to the information supplied by the *Book of Llandâv*. This is no case of founding or of dedication. There is another Llangybi in South Wales, and a third in Eifionydd, Carnarvonshire, where there is also a holy well called Ffynnon Gybi. Sanctus Kepius blessed Ethelic and proceeded to make a short visit of three days to *civitas Meneu Sancti David*, whence he departed for Ireland. His sojourn there was not happy, so he sailed back, making for the island of Mona. Difficulties met him here again in the popular opposition to monks, shown, for instance, in the story of the blacksmith who refused fire to the disciple Caffo unless he carried it in his garment, which of course, as in other tales, was at once done with perfect safety. Again the saint was opposed by Maelgwn, the prince of North Wales, a story which is somewhat confusingly told by the biographer. He seems not to have been acquainted with the locality, though a few main points stand out clearly in the narrative. The shepherds of Rhoshir killed Caffo, whose town (*oppidum*) was known as Merthyr Caffo. Maelgwn gave to Cybi 'the whole promontory' and his fortress (*castellum suum*), where Cybi died in great honour on the 8th day of November. The present *Vita*, as the close proves, was a sermon or lesson (*Lectio* = *Llith*) to be read on that 8th day of November year by year, and as such appears to be a late production.

The intercourse of Cybi with David and Maelgwn, as

described in the *Vita*, which must be about 540, renders the earlier account of companionship with Hilary at Poitiers, whose death occurred about 400, absolutely impossible. The whole of the long closing paragraph is quite in the style and phraseology (we notice *agius*) of the Life of St. David by Rychmarch. Yet *castellum* would be represented in the British *Caer*, which we find in *Caergybi*, denoting the place where, by the gift of Maelgwn to Almighty God and holy Cybi (*agio Kepio*), the saint led his secluded life as monk and ministered as bishop. Popular tradition may have preserved some element of historic truth in the story that he and Seiriol, who lived a life of seclusion on Ynys Seiriol (Puffin Island), occasionally met for religious communion near or at the well of Clorach, not far from Llandyfrydog. As the one travelled with his face to the west in the morning, so it is said, and to the east in the evening, he was called 'Seiriol wyn'—pale Seiriol; the other, who on his journey to the place of meeting faced the morning sun, while the bright setting sun shone on him as he travelled home, was called 'Cybi felyn'—tawny Cybi. A similar story is told of Cybi and Elian meeting in the same neighbourhood.

Cybi, the *Vita* informs us, had ten disciples; only five of these are mentioned by name. But it may be that after the death of Cybi, or even during his lifetime, these were led, as we have previously observed of others, to retire for the anchorite life to different parts of Anglesey. There are *llans* named after them reminiscent, presumably, of this fact, such as Llangaffo, Llanfaelog, Llanllibio, Llanbeulan; and Cengar is connected with Llangefni.

A certain term has been applied for some long time now to British Christians of this time or to some functionaries in their Church. I mean the term Culdees, who may have been originally peculiar to North Wales. The most reasonable view of them, to my mind, is that they were those who disagreed with the efforts made to bring the Britons over to the Roman and English way of observing Easter. Holding tenaciously to the 'old way' against the new views of Elvod and others, at Bangor, they separated themselves as the only real Britons, taking

to themselves a name that seems to signify 'servants of God'.[1] If this be correct they are at once placed beyond our present scope; they are not named by Beda, Adamnan, Cumin, or Eddi, nor in the Irish Catalogue of Saints. They are chiefly connected, so far as we know, with the island of Enlli, i.e. Bardsey, and are referred to as if they were the early settlers in the island. It is quite possible that a passage in which Giraldus Cambrensis was speaking of Enlii has been misunderstood. Almost by accident, while giving an account of his stay at Nevin in 1188, with Archbishop Baldwin, he adds, 'There lies outside Llŷn a small island inhabited by monks of the most devoted character, who are called Celibites (*Coelibes*), or Colidei.' This reference only deals with his own time, and is not concerned with the earliest settlements, while it is known that Enlli was held by canons[2] before a century had passed. The early history of the island, strange to say, is involved in obscurity. Rees, in the *History of the Welsh Saints*, brings forward a very unlikely legend. Cadvan, the story says, came over with a large retinue of followers from Armorica, and founded the first monastery on the island, being himself the first abbot. The whole history of the emigration to Armorica makes this return to Britain very unlikely.

Enlli was, no doubt, chosen early as an ideal spot for a monastery, though its first settlers must be enrolled among the hosts of God's *nameless* saints. Still, the statement which follows the *Lectiones* about St. Dubricius in the *Book of Llandâv* (p. 83), that he was buried at Enlli, is by no means incredible. It was thus an 'island of saints' early, very early, in the sixth century, and continued as a place of retreat and rest amid the cares and tumults of life for numberless pilgrims. Those were as real then as now, while the quieting calm of Enlli captivates the soul. So one feels after a visit there, and hours will quickly pass as one gazes

[1] A very exhaustive account of the Culdees will be found in the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 1898. To Ebrard there was in Britain 'a Rome-free' Church of the Culdees—*Cyldei*, as the latest form of the name runs in Latin.

[2] *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, xii, 3rd Series.

at it from the promontory of Lleyn. The *Book of Aneirin* contains a reference to this quietude:—

Kychuenychwy Enlli wiles
A lenwis miran mir edles,
. . . . .
Gwyr gorwynnaf ry annet,
En llwrw rwydheu ry gollet.[1]

The whole country around, in the ancient names of bays, streams, wells, hills, is reminiscent of the 'Saints of Enlli', and poetic effusions in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries added their strain of allusion to the older though unsung tale. I use the British term and say, the *saints* are everywhere, from Afon Saint to the end of Llŷn and its sacred island.

This monachism of the Celtic people of Britain lasted long. Exalted by the passionate fervour of a great revival, it had, nevertheless, within itself certain elements which weakened its permanence. We see it carried over to Ireland, and from Ireland to the continent of Europe, by Columbanus and his disciples. In them is reflected all that the Irish had learned from the Britons, and had themselves practised with equal, if not greater, earnestness. Columbanus was, as is well said of him, 'a most tenacious follower of Irish traditions'—*traditionum Scoticarum tenacissimus consectator*. When, therefore, we study the *Regula* of Columbanus, we are in reality studying provisions made in our own land for the maintenance of the monachism which the Irish borrowed. Its chief characteristic is severity, stern insistence upon the fullest and minutest obedience of all to the will of one in their common life. When speaking of severity we mean, on the one hand, the severest demands of rigour and exactitude in the perform-

[1] With no little hesitation the following rendering is offered:

With him I desire the rest of Enlli,
Which fills me with fair gains,
. . . . . .
I will ask the men for a dwelling,
For fully removing the loss.

ance of duties, and, on the other, the infliction of the severest punishment for any omission or neglect. Here, it is self-evident, are directions, born of a time of fervour, when the emotions are paramount, but unequal to the strain that comes upon the succeeding generations which go to make up the long life of a community. A few select souls may be faithful for a lifetime, and other strong select ones may take their place, but for the mass of men there comes a reaction. So it was with British monks when the *Regula* had lost its first power. Even in Columbanus's own days (*c.* 595–600) and before, at the time when Finian of Clonard wrote to Gildas, the monks were beginning to leave the coenobitic life of the monasteries, 'seeking a higher perfection in desert places,' and these solitaries, carrying with them the old name *llan*, to designate the cells in which they lived, spread the name over the whole country, becoming thereby the forerunners of the later parochial clergy. The *periglor*,[1] as such, was a descendant of the solitary who had abandoned his monastery. Columbanus carried to Luxeuil, to Bobbio, and other places a form of monachism which, in substance, must have had its origin in Britain, which also is reflected in the Rule or *Regula* that bears his name, and is, in many features, so different from the *Regula* drawn up by Caesarius of Arles or Benedict of Monte Casino.

The *Regula* of Columbanus may be read in full as edited by Seebass in vol. xvii of *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, pp. 218–34, with copious notes. Great emphasis is laid in it on the confession of sin at all times; further examination shows that it demands a life lived in every act by the practice of some religious observance; that life is guided by absolute obedience to another, with the entire suppression of all personal will or thought. Everything is done by command; there is constantly the fear of failure, and confession of it in every individual attempt at godliness; it seems to aim at the making of a man whose own broken will becomes the strong master-mind that disposes

[1] *Periglor* is probably a form of *paroecia*; to connect it with *periculosa oratio*—the perilous prayer of consecration—seems far-fetched.

with ease of every self-indulgent or self-directed desire. The *Regula* bristles with punishments, that is, stripes, fasts, and *superpositiones*. 'He who observes the benediction at table and does not answer the Amen is corrected by six stripes. Similarly, he who speaks while eating without any necessary cause on the part of another brother is corrected by six stripes. He who calls anything his own, by six stripes.' Further on: 'Whoever shall forget prayer before work or after work, twelve stripes. And he who shall eat without benediction, twelve stripes.' Silence, truthfulness, the clearing of the soul from envy and uncharitableness, and, above all, humility, are constantly enjoined; the final aim is the voluntary choice of the higher way and clinging to God (*carpere iter tendens ad alti fastigia summa*).[1] We find similar injunctions in a Penitential ascribed to Gildas, and in certain Irish Penitentials.

Hauck has described fully the spread of the monastic system by Irish missionaries in Gaul and the adjoining countries. The *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (vol. i) has hardly any pages of equal interest with those in which is discussed the history of this almost obstinate Irish missionary, who carried the remedies of penance and the desire for self-mortification[2] into a country enfeebled spiritually by the dominant barbarian, and by the negligence of its bishops. But beyond the personal history of Columbanus the same tendency is evident in the description of the manner in which this severe system in many monasteries roused different parts of our island out of their ease and their feeble goodness to a more ideal life of severe vigour. There

[1] On Columbanus we would especially recommend what Hauck has written of him in the first volume of the *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, and the exhaustive articles of Seebass beginning with vol. xiii of the *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*.

[2] 'Ubi tunc vel ob frequentia (*sic*) hostium externorum, vel neglegentia (*sic*) praesulum religionis, virtus pene abolita habebatur. Fides tantum manebat christiana, nam penitentiae medicamenta et mortificationis amor vix vel paucis in ea repperiebatur locis.' Jonas's *Life of Columbanus*, edited by Bruno Krusch, i, c. 5. See also i, cc. 10, 19, 30 (the separate octavo edition).

were, however, murmurs, as at Bangor against Comgall; the first vigour died away, and enthusiasm grew cooler. Another system possessing the characteristics of another order superseded the one detailed above. This was the Benedictine *Regula,* which belongs to about the same age as our British revivalists of monachism.[1] Of St. Benedict's Rule Dr. Hauck says that it 'proves itself to be throughout the work of a sober-minded genius and organizing talent. Here all the questions are answered which in the Rule of Columbanus (and in the British *Regulae*) remained undecided; what should be the procedure in the appointment of the abbot and the other functionaries, the relation of the abbot to the society of monks as of the monastery to the diocesan bishop, how the daily changes of work and edification were to be regulated, &c.' On all these points light was thrown by Benedict's directions—'directions which show that the caprice of the individual was excluded, without quite hindering the development of particular tendencies. Nowhere was the ideal of the ascetic life left out of sight, but everywhere there are evidences of the clear insight of a man who aims at the attainable. In this way the Rule of Benedict provided what was missing in that of the Britons and of Columbanus, a highly serviceable statute for every community of monks.'[2] Through Augustine of Canterbury, who was a Benedictine monk, it was introduced into the English Church, and though its spread was exceedingly slow among the English, as Beda testifies, yet in the not unknown fraternization between the two Churches, of which there is evidence in copies of the Latin Scriptures written during those times, the influence of this milder, saner rule of Benedict must have spread to and been accepted by the Britons. British monachism gradually faded away; another order took its place. What was good in it remained. To-day, when no actual vestiges of the several orders remain, a host of words, on the other hand, with place-names,

[1] The relation of the present texts to the original *Regula* is still under discussion. See Plenker's *Die ältesten latein. Mönchsregeln.*

[2] *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands,* i. 283.

names of seas, bays, islands, headlands, hills, valleys, rivers, wells, farmsteads, ruins, mounds, parishes, remind us, with ever-recurring interest, that the men of whom we have been thinking, together with their contemporaries and several generations of their followers, were once inhabitants of these parts of Britain ; documentary proofs have come down tc us of their manner of serving God and man, and of securing toilsomely and severely the salvation of their souls.

CHAPTER XXIII

ANNALES CAMBRIAE vel ANNALES BRITTONUM

Frequent reference is necessarily made to the Chronicle which generally bears the former of these two names. Hence, a careful examination of it is especially needful with a view to determining, as nearly as possible, its value as a source of information for, and as a guide in, historical investigation. Whence came such a Chronicle, or the materials for it? Why also does it begin its enumeration of years as i, ii, iii, starting from an initial year that appears, and is generally taken to be, A. D. 444? The view advanced in these pages, respecting these questions and some others, is one which the reading of the Chronicle itself has led the present writer to adopt. Other views, which are probably either wrong or inapplicable, will be examined in turn.

These *Annales* furnish a Chronicle of events extending from A. D. 444 to 954. Hitherto the Chronicle has been called the *Annales Cambriae* (Annals of Cambria), but I am fully convinced that another title is, upon many grounds, preferable, namely, the alternative given above in the heading of this chapter. It is the only one suggested by the work in which it appears. The *Historia Brittonum* of Nennius, written in the Harleian MS. 3859 (British Museum), gives this Chronicle as an integral part of itself, and along with it an interesting series of British Pedigrees, which has been extensively drawn upon by writers on Celtic antiquities. The title *Annales Cambriae*, for which *Annales Brittonum* should be substituted, was coined by Petrie for the first edition, edited by him in the *Monumenta Historica Britannica* (1848). The Chronicle, however, and the Pedigrees, are both omitted in Mommsen's edition of Nennius. Petrie called the Harleian MS. employed by him A, but with it he associated two other MSS. of a later date, and far inferior to it in quality. One

of these he called B, the other C. The former, B, is in the Record Office, and the last date recorded in it is 1286; the latter, C, is in the Cottonian Library, Domitian A. 1, with 1288 as its last entry. The *Annales* have been published also in the Rolls Series, edited by the Rev. John Williams (Ab Ithel), 1860.

These two editions have now been superseded by the transcript, which Mr. Egerton Phillimore has published in *Y Cymmrodor*, vol. ix, pp. 152–69, of the Harleian MS., with which may also be compared his remarks on p. 144 as to the compilation of the Chronicle—more correctly the last part of it—a few years after the death of Hywel Dda (950), under his son Owen.

Annales Cambriae as a title is certainly inappropriate; it is apocryphal and misleading. The Chronicle in the Harleian MS. reads continuously as an integral part of Nennius's work with no separate heading whatever. A fresh investigation of this and the other MSS. leads the present writer to the conclusion that none of them gives countenance to the term *Cambriae*; probably its introduction is solely a result of Petrie's editorship in 1848. It would have been better, following Nennius's own example elsewhere, had he used the alternative title of *Annales Brittonum*. Nennius's words respecting other Annals fully suggest this inference.[1]

I am inclined to think that two compilers have been at work on the Chronicle as a whole. One writer is responsible for the first entry of all, as well as for those for 626, 665, 768, and 809; another may have carried on the *Annales* from, say, 822 to 954.

The first annalist belonged, to all appearance, to the circle of those who favoured the attempt of Elvod, Bishop of Bangor, to introduce the Roman, or rather at that time the Anglo-Roman, in place of the British rule for fixing Easter Sunday. Nennius calls himself the disciple of Elvod,[2] and mentions him as 'the holiest of bishops'; with similar appreciation the annalist speaks of Elvod as Archbishop of

[1] See in c. i, 'de annalibus Romanorum . . . de annalibus Scotorum Saxonumque, *et ex traditione veterum nostrorum*.'

[2] *Historia Brittonum*, p. 143, c. i: 'Ego Nennius Elvodugi discipulus.'

Gwynedd, and chronicles the year in which he prevailed upon the Britons to change their Easter (*Pasca commutatur*); the year of Elvod's death is also duly chronicled by him. He shares with Nennius this reverence for Elvod, and quotes, as he does, an erroneous statement made originally by Elvod and another bishop respecting the baptism of Edwin, King of Northumbria, and his family, by Rhun, son of Urien (*Run map Urbeghen* or *Run map Urbgen*), erroneously. He identifies Rhun with Paulinus, Archbishop of York.[1] Elvod, though little is recorded of him, seems to have been a man of great importance, and his confusion of Rhun with Paulinus appears to prove an acquaintance on his part with Beda's *History of the English Church.*

In recent years several conjectures have been advanced as to the origin of the *Annales* and the adoption of 444 as the initial year. We observe that the MS. has simply i An', ii An', iii An', &c., with many blanks, the entries standing opposite to years designated in this way. For instance, the first entry is opposite ix An', the second opposite to xiii An', &c. Two questions may be asked: first, why no use is made of *Anni Domini*? secondly, why the annalist chose, if he did so, A.D. 444 as his first year? The answer to the first question is not difficult. The entries were made at a time when dating by the Christian era was not in common use among the Britons. At the earliest this way of reckoning could not have been employed before A.D. 525, but, as a matter of fact, it is well known that it did not become prevalent in several countries for two centuries, or even more. It was in the English Church, and mainly through Beda, that the use of *Anni Domini* in Britain began. The second question, which is the more important one, now demands an answer. Why was 444 selected as the initial year? Prof. Bury, in his *Life of St. Patrick*, commenting on Dr. MacCarthy's theory that the *Annales Cambriae* were based on a Paschal table, makes

[1] *Historia Brittonum*, p. 207 'Run map Urbeghen, id est Paulinus Eboracensis archiepiscopus, eos baptizavit.' Paulinus became Archbishop of York in 684. Beda, *H. E.* ii. 17.

the suggestion that such a table might have been brought over to Britain by Garmon (Germanus) in 445, and would consequently have 444 as its initial year.

There could have been no reason, it may be objected, for the introduction of any table of Easter to Britain by Garmon, as Gaul and Britain, at that time, were at one in their calculation of the Sunday for the celebration of the Paschal feast. Besides, Levison, in the very article referred to by Prof. Bury, only shows that the death of Germanus occurred probably in 450, stating also his view that the visit—his second—to Britain took place 'about 447'.[1] No explanation can be found, I am persuaded, in this conjecture either of the origin of the Chronicle or of the choice of the year 444, from which its entries are dated. Moreover, the table, if a Paschal table, or based on such a table, must be later than 457, since the passages introductory to the *Annales* are, in substance, extracts from the Paschal table prepared in that year by Victorius, a man of Aquitaine, and a learned mathematician. The method introduced by Victorius will be explained in Chap. XXVI, but it should be observed that Nennius was also well acquainted with the Alexandrian nineteen-year cycle, brought into vogue for the first time in the West by Dionysius Exiguus, in A.D. 525.[2]

Mr. Nicholson, Bodley's Librarian, insists most strongly that the *Annales* consist of marginal entries made on a copy of the Paschal cycle of Victorius, belonging, as he also holds, to the church of St. Davids, and written probably in 509. It is thus based on an eighty-four year cycle with one year added.[3] I incline to a conclusion different from the two just mentioned. Why was 444 selected as the initial year? In the first place, the first entry in the *Annales* is *not* a Paschal entry, but the record of a *change* in the time of its celebration—*Pasca commutatur*. Also in 665 we have a curiously significant record—'The first Easter is celebrated among the Saxons.' The writer by his use of *Saxones* must

[1] Bury, *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 258; Levison in *Neues Archiv*, xxix. 127.
[2] *Nennius*, Mommsen's ed., p. 159, 'cyclus decemnovalis.'
[3] *Zeitschrift f. celtische Philologie*, 1908, vi. s. 443.

be a Briton, acquainted, we may add, chiefly with the Northern English, and, a point of greater significance, he is thus describing as 'first Easter' the abandonment of the Celtic Easter for the Roman, consequent upon the success achieved by Wilfrid in his debate with Colman at the Synod of Whitby, A. D. 664. Further, opposite 768, repeating the words of the first entry—*pasca commutatur*—'the time of celebrating Easter is changed,' he says, 'among the Britons by the correction of Elvod, man of God.' Again, opposite 809, he records the death of Elvod, 'Archbishop of the region of Gwynedd.' Three important *changes* in respect to Easter, every one in the same direction, are thus commemorated. The tendency paramount in this chronicler's mind, it seems plain, was *from* the old British *to* the newer Roman, just as Elvod had striven to lead his countrymen. We detect in these records an evident motive. They are dictated by views which the chronicler had learnt at first hand from Elvod, and in these two men we seem to find the earliest effect of the reiterated condemnation passed upon the Britons by Beda, with whose *History* Elvod was apparently acquainted. We come back to the year 444. *It was in this year and after it that Rome saw the inevitable breakdown of the eighty-four year cycle.* The Church of Rome had on several occasions come into conflict in its reckonings with the ancient and superior method of Alexandria; sometimes the one yielded, sometimes the other. Alexandria had learning and scientific principles, Rome had tradition and rude working methods, acquired by revisions of the eighty-four year cycle. In 444 the Bishop of Alexandria held tenaciously to April 23 instead of the Roman April 16 as the true date for Easter of that year. Leo yielded at once; and in 444–55 there began attempts to find better methods. It was in 444 that Rome definitely decided to change its day, and it is in this fact that we find the explanation why that year was selected as the initial year of a Chronicle by a writer who sympathized with the changes then inaugurated.

Between that year and 455, attempts were set on foot with a view to the adoption of some course that might save collision with Alexandria and with the whole of the East—

Palestine, Asia Minor, Syria, and, above all, the imperial city of Constantinople.

A new method was published in 447, but this broke down in 455. There are three letters of Leo the Great on this subject, written in 454, relating to the Easter of 455. It is clear from the second and third letters that the Emperor Marcian, after correspondence with Alexandria, was now against the Roman day, and Leo yielded.[1] Let us mark also that this change is the first entry in our Annals, put, though erroneously as in other entries, as occurring in ix An', that is, 453 instead of 455. These are two significant advances, both of them towards the method which had become essentially Roman by the time that Augustine held his conference in 603, and continued so until the time when, later, the annalist, with strong Roman predilections, wrote the Chronicle. It might be some years after 809, say about A.D. 830–40. Here, I feel, is the explanation of i An' being 444, and of ix An', the record made for 453, but more correctly 455, when there was again a difference of one week between Rome and Alexandria.

There does not seem to be any special reason for agreeing with Mr. Nicholson that the Chronicle as a Paschal table had its home at St. Davids. It is not a Paschal table, and though it be true that Menevia is mentioned several times, yet there is in the whole extent of the Annals such a comprehensiveness of character as to suggest its connexion with some place further north, probably not in Gwynedd. I am inclined to favour the neighbourhood of Builth. Its entries contain records of Irish, English, Roman, and British events, which render the name *Annales Cambriae* utterly inappropriate.

The paragraphs made to precede the *Annales*, beginning 'A mundi principio . . .,' are simply extracts from Nennius's *Historia*. They may be read in Mommsen's edition, p. 209, where also the editor's notes show the large use made by Nennius of the Paschal table of Victorius.

[1] *Epistolae* 121, 137, 138. Migne, tom. liv. The last is addressed to 'The Bishops of the Gauls (Galliae) and Spain', and under *Galliae*, in official documents, Britain would be included.

I insert here the Annals from Annus i to Annus clxix, that is, from A.D. 444 to A.D. 613.

444 i An' blank, and so up to viii An'.

453 ix An'. Pasca commutatur super diem dominicum cum papa Leone episcopo Romae.

The letter of Leo to the bishops of Gaul (including Britain) and Spain has, at the announcement of the change he had made *for the sake of unity and peace* (*'studio unitatis et pacis'*): *Valentiniano viii et Anthemio coss. Pascha viii Kalendas Maias*, i.e. in 455 Easter will be on the 23rd of April. Ep. 138, Migne, liv. *Super diem dominicum* relates to the fact that the change was a week, from April 16 to April 23, a detail that shows the chronicler's acquaintance with history. Prosper Tiro of Aquitaine has a long explanation of the decision to fall in with the Bishop of Alexandria, 'whom all the Orientals think they ought to follow.' The Britons agree 'with Papa Leo' in making the change. Mr. Egerton Phillimore's philological explanation, though accepted by Loth, seems quite unnecessary and historically wrong. The entry when compared with Leo's letter to the bishops proves that there was communication at this time (454) between Britain and the Bishop of Rome as in 314 after Arles.

454 x An'. Brigidia sancta nascitur.

Now follow a number of Irish records which show that the annalist is acquainted with Irish Annals, and is, probably, led to imitate as well as copy them.

Brigida in the British tongue appears in the names of churches, as Lan san Bregit, Lan San Breit, Lan San Freit, San Ffreid, and in Modern Welsh as Llan Sant Ffraid.

xi Annus: xii Annus, both blanks.

From this point we print *Annus* in full, though the MS. throughout has An'.

457 xiii Annus. Sanctus Patricius ad Dominum migratur.

St. Patrick's death is placed by White and Bury in 461. Bury concludes that Tirechan's 'a passione Christi . . . anni cccxxxvi' ought to be corrected into cccxxxiii, which, remembering that Tirechan regarded 29 as the year of the Passion, brings us to A.D. 461. *Life of St. Patrick*, p. 382; White, *Libri S. Patricii*, p. 230.

xiv Annus . . . . xxiii Annus.

467 xxiv Annus. Quies Benigni episcopi.

Benignus followed Patrick as bishop.

xxv Annus . . . . lvi Annus.

501 lvii Annus. Episcopus Ebur pausat in Christo anno ccci etatis suae.

lviii Annus . . . . lxxi Annus.

516 lxxii Annus. Bellum Badonis in quo Arthur portavit crucem domini nostri Iesu Christi, tribus diebus et tribus noctibus, in humeros suos, et Brittones victores fuerunt.

The image of the Virgin, Nennius says, was carried by Arthur in his eighth battle; of the cross we find no mention. Cf. Geoffrey of Mon. ix. 4; Henry of Hunt. ii. 18.

lxxiii Annus . . . . lxxvi Annus.

521 lxxvii Annus. Sanctus Columcille nascitur. Quies sanctae Brigidae.

If this date be correct Columba would be about twenty years younger than Gildas.

lxxviii Annus . . . . xcii Annus.

537 xciii Annus. Gweith Camlann in qua Arthur et Medraut corruerunt; et mortalitas in Brittania et in Hibernia fuit.

Gweith and *cat* are British terms for battle. The death of Arthur is placed by Geoffrey in 542.

xciv Annus . . . . xcix Annus.

544 c Annus. Dormitatio Ciarani.

Ciaran is Abbot of Cluain mac Nois in the Annals of Tigernach.

ci Annus . . . . cii Annus.

547 ciii Annus. Mortalitas magna in qua pausat Mailcun rex Guenedotae.

Mailcun, or Maelgwn Gwynedd, is the same as the Maglocunus of Gildas; by Geoffrey he is called Malgo. His death, in the Irish Annales Tigernachi, where all the dates, by subsequent insertion, are later than the Annals themselves, is referred to 550. Guenedota, as Venedota, is now Gwynedd, North Wales.

civ Annus . . . . cxiii Annus.

558 cxiv Annus. Gabran filius Dungart moritur.

Gabran was King of Albania.

cxv Annus . . . . cxvii Annus.

562 cxviii Annus. Columcill*ae* in Brittania exivit.

The Annals of Tigernach give: 'Navigatio Columbae Cillae ad insulam Jan. ann. 563.'

Beda (iii. 4) narrates that 'Columba came into Britain in the ninth year of Bridius, who was the son of Meilochon.' This king is Bruide MacMaelchon, who conquered the Dalriadic Scots (Irish) in 560. His ninth year thus somewhat tallies with 569.

cxix Annus . . . . cxxv Annus.

570 cxxvi Annus. Gildas obiit.

Gildas died in Brittany.

cxxvii Annus . . . cxxviii Annus.

573 cxxix Annus. Bellum Armterid.

Armterid must be Arderydd, or Ardderyd; the battle resulted in the consolidation of the kingdom of Rhydderch Hael at Dumbarton, and the recall of Kentigern to be again Bishop of Glasgow after he had founded the monastery of Llanelwy (St. Asaph).

574 cxxx Annus. Brendan Byror moritur.

An Irish abbot.

cxxxi Annus . . . . cxxxv Annus.

580 cxxxvi Annus. Guurci et Peretur moritur.

These two names are often found together; the two men are represented to be the sons of *Eliffer Gosgordd vawr*. Aneirin mentions *Peredur Arcay dur* as being among the killed of Cattraeth; he may be another personage, as Cattraeth was some twenty or more years later than this date.

cxxxvii Annus . . . . cxxxix Annus.

584 cxl Annus. Bellum contra Euboniam; et dispositio (depositio) Damielis Bancorum.

Eubonia is the Isle of Man. The plural form *Bancorum* is strange. Daniel's death is placed very late, if, as the *Book of Llandâv* states (p. 71), he was contemporary with Dubricius and Illtud.

cxli Annus . . . . cxliv Annus.

589 cxlv Annus. Conversio Constantini ad Dominum.

One of the five princes named by Gildas is Constantinus, King of Damnonia (Devon), but he was a Christian when Gildas wrote; if this Constantine be the same person, there is here an implication that in extreme old age he remembered the 'Come to Christ,' *Veni ad Christum* (c. 29), of Gildas, the 'Come to Christ' addressed to him of old, and

became a monk. But it seems to me that a different person must be meant.

cxlvi Annus . . . . cl Annus.

595 cli Annus. Columcille moritur. Dunaud rex moritur. Augustinus, Mellitus Anglos ad Christum convertit.

The date of Columba's death is placed one year later in the Annals of Tigernach. Augustine's mission also belongs to the following year, 596, or more probably 597.

clii Annus . . . . clvi Annus.

601 clvii Annus. Sinodus Urbis Legion. Gregorius obiit in Christo. David episcopus Moni Iudeorum (obiit).

This Synod of Urbs Legion, mentioned immediately after the name of St. Augustine, may be his second conference with the British bishops described in ii. 2 of Beda's *History*. Beda places the first on the borders of the Hwiccas and West Saxons; an indefinite fixing of locality which has prompted several conjectures. See Plummer's Notes. But the second, more important and more formal, meeting might have been elsewhere, and there were present, besides the seven bishops, 'many men of great learning' from the monastery of Bangor on the Dee.

Gregory's death took place in 604; thus we find the Chronicle wrong by a few years.

Moni Iudeorum is certainly a scribal error. Plainly taken, nothing can be found in it to suggest the river Aeron, or support any removal from Dewi's birthplace, as is said, at Hen Fynyw in Cardiganshire to Pembroke. I am inclined rather to attempt a correction of the scribe's oversight; thus *Moni Iudeorum*, which is meaningless, may, by a rearrangement of the letters, be for *Moniui De(met)orum*. Moniui, that is, Moniu, is frequently found for our *Mynyw*.

clviii Annus . . . clxi Annus.

606 clxii Annus. Dispositio (Depositio) Cinaric episcopi.

607 clxiii Annus. Aidan map Gabran moritur.
clxiv Annus . . . clxvii Annus.

612 clxviii Annus. Conthigirn obitus et Dibric episcopi.

In these two names we have Kentigern or Cyndeyrn and Dyvric or Dubricius. The true date of Kentigern's death is very difficult to fix: Joceline says that he died on a Sunday; the day of his commemoration is January 13, and by combining these two Mr. Skene finds the year A.D. 603. Jan. 13 was a Sunday in 603 and 614; he chooses the former. These Annals place the date nearer 614. The date in the record of the death of Dubricius is impossible. See Ch. XIX.

613 clxix Annus. Gweith Cair legion. Et ibi cecedit Selim filius Cinan. Et Iacob filii Beli dormitatio.

In the battle of Caerlleon, i. e. Chester, was slain Selim (later Selyv, i. e. Solomon), son of Cynan ; and Iago (James) son of Beli fell on sleep. This is the celebrated battle of Chester, narrated in Beda, *H. E.* ii. 2, which had disastrous consequences for the Britons in separating 'the men of the North' from those in Wales and the borderland. The effect, however, was not felt immediately, as the old *status quo* continued, partly political, partly ecclesiastical.

clxx Annus . . . clxxi Annus.

616 clxxii Annus. Ceretic (Ceredig) obiit.

617 clxxiii Annus. Etguin (Edwin) incipit regnare.
clxxiv Annus . . . clxxix Annus.

624 clxxx Annus. Sol obscuratus est.
clxxxi Annus.

626 clxxxii Annus. Etguin baptizatus est. Et Run filius Urbgen baptizavit eum.

This is almost a verbal repetition from Nennius's *Historia*. Run, the son of Urien, is said to have baptized Edwin. The son of a British king thus baptizes an English king, having previously baptized his daughter Eanfled and a host of others, a work that occupied him fully forty days. It was Bishop Renchidus and Elvod, Bishop of Bangor, who furnished this information to Nennius himself, but as Beda expressly states that their baptism had been performed by Paulinus, Archbishop of York, we see that the two men, Run and Paulinus, are identified—'Run map Urbeghen, id est Paulinus Eboracensis archiepiscopus, eos baptizavit,' Mommsen's *Nennius*, p. 207. We see from this confused notice that a native tradition of conversions and a historical fact have been mixed, yet even a blunder is sometimes significant; that is the case here. The Chronicle repeats what Nennius declares had been told him by his 'master' Elvod of Bangor, well versed in affairs of the north.

The *Annales* end with dx Annus, which corresponds to A.D. 954, so that we have omitted, because too far beyond the scope of this work, 228 years, many of which, however, are left blank.

Yet of these I select the following for a special reason :—

665 ccxxi Annus. Primum Pasca apud Saxones celebratur. Bellum Badonis ii. Morcant moritur.

The 'first Easter among the Saxons' mentioned here is that which

was first celebrated according to the Roman computation as decided upon at the Synod of Whitby (664), where Wilfrid succeeded in persuading King Oswy and the Church to abandon the Celtic mode of reckoning as heretical. We see here also the tendency of the compiler of the Annals; he belongs, as has been said, to those who followed Archbishop Elvod of Bangor in departing from the custom maintained among the Britons since A.D. 314. The Celtic Easter of Aidan, Finan, and Colman, whose episcopate and work extended over just thirty years, was, to his mind, null and void. Northumbria had its first, that is, its real Easter when the feast became Roman, or, as Beda says, when, forsaking the practices of the Scots (i.e. Irish, which were identical with the practices of the British), they submitted to the Catholic observance of Easter. See Beda's *History*, Book iii. 25.

768 cccxxiv Annus. Pasca commutatur apud Brittones, emendante Elbodugo homine Dei.

The convictions of the chronicler are very marked in this record, because it refers to the efforts made by Elvod to introduce, among the Britons, the Roman Easter. The same fact is also narrated with two years' difference of date in *Brut y Tywysogion*: 'Deg mlyned a thrugein a seith cant (770) oed oet Crist pan symudwyt pasc y Brytanyeit drwy orchymyn Elbot gwr y Duw,' Evans's edition, p. 258.

808 ccclxiv Annus. Regin rex Demetorum et Catell Pouis moriuntur.

Regin is an older form of *Rein*, and *Catell Pouis* of *Cadell* (king of) Powys.

809 ccclxv Annus. Elbodg archiepiscopus Guenedote regionis migravit ad Dominum.

Brut y Tywysogion (258) combines these two records: 'Ac y bu varw Rein vrenhin, a Chadell brenhin Powys, ac Elbot archesgob Gwynedd,' Evans's edition. The date given in the *Brut* is uncertain, and might be any year between 800 and 810.

The MS. itself of Nennius which contains the *Annales* is said by Bradshaw to belong to the end of Century xi (*Collected Papers of Henry Bradshaw*, p. 466). I assume that this disciple of Elvod might have lived some thirty years after 800–9, and place his work approximately, as already intimated, between 830 and 840, another compiler continuing the Chronicle to the death of Hywel Dda in 950.

As a British document which touches upon the later Western attempts to arrive at the best way of calculating the time of the true Easter, revealing the writer's complete

sympathy with the latest Roman method in Britain, the Chronicle of which the contents have been discussed in this chapter is undoubtedly of great interest and value. Its initial year, as known by the Letters of Leo I, accords with the time of a most important event; its entries, arranged as a Chronicle from that year, though occasionally wrong by a year or two, are not, on this account, inferior to the records of other Annals. Facts and personal history from many quarters have been strung together, but the compiler is chiefly drawn to Cambrian and Northumbrian personages. It is here that we have the last mention of administrative relations of any kind between the Bishop of Rome and Britain, until Gregory the Great sent out his mission for the conversion of the English. Its significance, above all, lies in the fact that he, guided by the Archbishop of Gwynedd, is the first British writer we know of to abandon ancient British ideas and accept the Roman, or Anglo-Roman, views as to the due observance of Easter, with, probably, other Roman views as well in respect of customs and usages in Church life. The author of the *Annales* thus inserted in the *Historia* may have been Nennius himself. If that is so, Nennius and his master, Elvod, have given us cause, in their literary remains, to remember them with thankfulness.

CHAPTER XXIV

ECCLESIASTICAL REFERENCES IN THE EARLY LITERATURE OF THE BRITISH TONGUE

The following are works bearing on this subject:—

Gildas, *De Excidio Britanniae*, cc. 12–24, 34.

Nennius, *Historia Brittonum*, c. 62.

Juvencus, *Historia Evangelica*—the Cambridge MS.

The *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, edited by Skene, vols. i, ii.

The four books are—

(1) The *Black Book of Caermarthen—Llyvyr Du Caerfyrddin*, written in the Priory of the Black Canons at Caermarthen. We have now the advantage of a new edition by Dr. Gwenogfryn Evans, reproducing the original, besides the collotype facsimile published by him in 1888.

(2) The *Book of Aneirin*. The MS. is said to be of the thirteenth century; it is now in the Cardiff Free Library. See *Report on Welsh MSS.*, vol. ii. part i. pp. 91. 259. Historical MSS. Commission.

(3) The *Red Book of Hergest—Llyvyr Coch Hergest*. The MS. is of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and belongs to Jesus College, Oxford. See *Report on Welsh MSS.*, vol. ii, part i.

(4) The *Book of Taliesin*. The MS., of the fourteenth century, belonged to the Peniarth Library. *Report on Welsh MSS.*, vol. i, part iii, p. 300. It is now in the National Library of Wales.

Stephens's work on the *Gododin* has been republished and edited by Prof. Powell of Cardiff for the Cymmrodorion Society. Other contributions by Stephens (added by the Editor in an Appendix) materially qualify Skene's remarks in vol. i, pp. 190, 210; vol. ii, p. 365.

Irish literature has a bearing on our subject, e. g. Zimmer's *Keltische*

Studien and *Pelagius in Irland*, Windisch's *Irische Texte*, but especially the *Tripartite Life of St. Patrick* by Whitley Stokes (Rolls Series). The latter's *Lives of the Saints from the Book of Lismore* has also been consulted for the present work.

Of more direct value is the *Irish Liber Hymnorum* by J. H. Bernard and R. Atkinson, forming vols. xiii, xiv of the publications of the Henry Bradshaw Society. Reference may now be made to a completer collection of hymns, *Die Hymnen des Thesaurus Hymnologicus H .A. Daniels und anderer Hymnen-Ausgaben*, by Father Clemens Blume. See pars ii, *Hymnodia Hiberno-Celtica* (Leipzig, 1908). What the editor says of the *Book of Cerne* is interesting and pertinent.

Nash in his destructive criticisms deals almost exclusively with one of these bards (Taliessin), and his task is not difficult. There is a valuable paper by Prof. Anwyl on the Cymry of the North and those of North Wales—a reprint from the *Celtic Review*. Other writers, such as Sharon Turner, even Villemarque's *Les Bardes Bretons*, based though it is on a close study of the old British poems, 'ces jardins des Hespérides celtiques,' need not be further noticed here. Articles which are of value have appeared in *Annales de Bretagne* (1900) by Ferdinand Lot, especially those entitled *Études sur Merlin*. Gaston Paris also has given close attention to these questions, and M. J. Loth in his *Mabinogion*, vol. i, pp. 89–90 : 'Dans les poèmes donnés sous son nom, et qui sont peut-être, à certains égards, les plus curieux de la littérature galloise. . . .' This is said of the poems that go under the name of Taliessin. We may compare Zimmer in *Nennius Vindicatus*, p. 103, note.

The earliest language of the Church in Britain must at first have been almost exclusively Latin. Hence Christian Latin terms, in course of time, crowded into the British vernacular.

In another sphere it is observable how agricultural terms came at a very early period into Welsh ; to-day we find in ordinary everyday use such words as *anifel*, *ystrodur*, *torth*, *aradr*, *swch*, *cwlltwr*, *bagl*, *armel*, *bresych*, *gwal*, *ystod*, *ysgafn o fawn*, *ysgafn o yd*, *ysgawnu*, *gwig*, *parawd*, *ceulo* ; these were all borrowed from the Latin tongue in Roman times. So also it may be argued that *trined*, *uned*, *ciwed*, early forms derived from trinitas, unitas and civitas, came into the language at successive periods ; so did *eglwys*, *bedydd*, *pader*, *cardawd* (*caritatem*, love), *cyffes*, *cymun*, *pregeth*, *clerig*, *gosper*, *athrywyn*, *rhad Duw*, *cred*, *llusern*, *llên*, *ynyd*, *merthyr*, *offeren*, *cûr*, *nadolig*, *llith*, *bendith*, *melldith*,

paradwys, *creawdyr*, *pechod*, *penyd*, *achub*, *arawd*, *addoli*, *profi*, *syber*, *yspryd*, and many more (cf. p. 330).[1] Most of these words, if not all, were in the language, though not in their modern form, it is true, ages before their first appearance in song or gloss or inscription. Latin was formed into almost a new tongue by the use Tertullian made of it, and still more profound was the influence exercised upon it by the great Augustine, evolving from it a vehicle of Christian thought and feeling. Christian Latin was extensively borrowed by the British, so that their own tongue was enriched and became in its turn another instrument for the expression of Christian thought. Rude it must have been at first, and rude it continued for a long time, as the language was new to literature, but it made immense progress, a progress that by the twelfth and thirteenth centuries surprises us.

Celtic philology has flourished greatly since the time of Zeuss, having attracted to itself many researchers in France, Germany, England, and Wales. It has included within its scope a study of the Welsh language and literature. Much has been gained, but it has been chiefly of a linguistic character. Its investigations have not been directly on the British tongue as a vehicle of thought in religion, or as an instrument for the special purposes of a Church, yet the investigation of changes which words undergo and of old grammatical forms is of especial value. Of two words, for instance, which represent *trinitas* (trinity) it is known that *trined* is much older than *trindawd*; the former, along with *uned*, *ciwed*, belongs to Roman times when the nominative case singular was employed, whilst the latter came into use during the era when the accusative is found side by side with and for the nominative. This enables us to date phrases more exactly, and in many other ways the results of linguistic researches help us.

The question which it would be well to be able to answer is this: At what time did the language of the people themselves become for the Church a medium of Christian teach-

[1] There must be about a thousand words in Welsh borrowed from Latin.

ing and worship? So far as we know the Scriptures existed only in Latin; the ritual of the Church, its conduct of public worship, was, we may assume, in the same tongue. In this fact the whole West contrasts most strongly with the East. There are precious early documents, scriptural, ritualistic, and doctrinal, written in Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, and Gothic. But throughout the West—and it was due not to the exercise of any authority, ecclesiastic or civil—one language universally prevailed in religion and politics. Gildas quotes a Latin Bible, and the literature he read was Latin. It was the same in the early English Church; Latin, not English, was, so to speak, its official language, though there were priests in the time of Beda who did not know even their Creed in Latin. Turning to Ireland we observe a rich Christian literature in the Old Irish dialect, side by side with Latin hymns of both home and continental origin. This is exactly what we should have expected to find in Britain. St. Patrick wrote in Latin, but not much later than his time there existed also hymns and explanatory introductions to hymns in Irish. This was about the time when intercourse between Britain and Ireland was closest and most frequent. While Latin hymns, to the existence of which in Britain we have clear reference in Gildas,[1] may have been carried over to Ireland, there is no British literature to be compared with that in which Ireland is rich. Yet the *Book of Cerne* seems to show features which in contrast to the Irish are Celtic. Though the Scriptures read in the public service and even the ritual used were in Latin, the preacher was free to instruct the people in the vulgar language, and the biographer of Samson expressly informs us that the Saint was in the habit of preaching to the people *in their own tongue*. On this account and because the learned in familiar intercourse with friends spoke in the vernacular, there came into it a host of words from the highly-developed Christian Latin tongue, with which they

[1] c. 25, *Contantes*, i.e. intoning the Psalm 44, 12. They celebrate feast days; the sacred office they perform with clean heart and lips; all exult as children cherished in the bosom of their mother the Church. c. 34, in the tuneful voice of Christ's followers with its sweet rhythm.

were also familiar in literature and in matters of ritual. These Latin terms were not suited for ordinary use. But they were soon made suitable. In friendly intercourse they were badly pronounced and became regularly British by reason of this 'bad' pronunciation. *Senedd*, e. g., at first had an ecclesiastical meaning, being the British name for the Church *synodus*, also written *sinodus* and *senodus*; *bac'lacus* from *baculus*, became *balawc*, a priest; *prifder*, through *prebiter*, represents presbyter; *offeren* (*missa*, mass) is *offerenda*; *sacrificium* becomes *segyrffig*, so *effeiriad* or *offeiriad* is connected with *offerre*, implying offering or sacrifice.

Nennius speaks of bards, who, during the sixth century, wrote poetry in the language of Britain. 'At that time,' he says, 'Talhaearn, father of inspired song, was famed in poetry; at the same time also Aneirin and Taliessin, and Bluchbard, and Cian called Gwenith Gwawd, were alike famed in British poetry.'[1] Skene, with no shadow of reason, takes Bluchbard to be Llywarch Hen. Bluchbard's name does not appear elsewhere, and reluctantly we dismiss him from our thoughts; so also Cian, though we remember a Llan Gian.[2] But it will be marked that neither Llywarch Hen nor Merddin (Merlin) is mentioned

[1] *Hist. Brittonum*, c. lxii, p. 205: 'Tunc Talhaern Tataguen claruit et Neirin (Aneurin), et Taliessin, et Bluchbard, et Cian, qui vocatur Gueinth Guaut, simul uno tempore in poemate Britannico claruerunt.' In the *Black Book of Caermarthen* we read of 'Tedei tad awen'; 'et Neirin' is a scribe's error, who took the vowel *a* of Aneirin as a conjunction; as such it means *and*, hence this reading. Gueinth Guaut, probably, as now written, Gwenith Gwawd, meaning the mature grain of praise. Gwawd, strangely, has come to have the contrary meaning of dispraise or derision.

[2] A Cian or Kian is mentioned in one of the poems in the *Book of Taliesin* (Skene, vol. i, p. 525; vol. ii, p. 130).

Trwy ieith Taliessin,	By the language of Taliessin,
Bu dyd emellin	Came the bright (?) day
Kian, pan darfu	Of Kian, when it came to pass
Lliaws, y gyfolu.	That multitudes joined in his praise.

I have not followed the translation in Skene's book; I also differ from it elsewhere.

in this short list of bards, though they, and works of theirs, are elsewhere placed as contemporary.

At the outset a somewhat important objection demands consideration. May the passage quoted above from Nennius not mean that the poems of Talhaearn, Taliessin, and Aneirin were 'British poetry' simply in the sense of being *written in Britain*, while the language employed was Latin? Against this it may be answered that Nennius several times mentions 'our language' (*nostra lingua*) as meaning the British tongue, and once *Britannicus sermo* without doubt means British as distinguished from Latin.[1] In view of these passages, the inference seems clear that the *Historia Brittonum* gives evidence of the existence of poetical pieces written in their native tongue by British bards as early as the seventh and eighth centuries. The clear statement made by Nennius is a warning against rash conclusions based simply on language and style. The absence of two notable names in the list given by Nennius has already been referred to, but while Llywarch Hen and Merddin are not named in it, on the other hand nothing, or very little, is known of any productions by Talhaearn, Bluchbard, or Cian. Thus, Taliessin and Aneirin alone remain. But there are reasons which compel us still to admit the possibility in the case of Llywarch Hen and Merddin. These may or may not be Welsh bards—*bardi Cambrenses in eorum libris antiquis et authenticis*, as Giraldus (*c.* 1180) writes.

My acquaintance with this literature is, I fully admit, scantier than it ought to be. But all that is put forward in the present chapter amounts in the main to this. At a very early time, when the liturgical language of the Church was Latin, a host of purely Christian and ecclesiastical Latin expressions made a home in the British mind and tongue. This took place as early even as Roman times. The propagation of the faith made such a process necessary. There was a church of the native Britons, and

[1] See pp. 178, 179, 187; p. 165, 'murum et aggerem . . . deduxit, et vocatur Brittanico sermone Guaul (= Gwal = vallum) Episford, in nostra autem lingua Rithergabail,' where *Rith* is the equivalent of the modern *Rhyd*.

in it were used forms of words familiar even to-day to those who know Welsh.

When Nennius, the disciple of Elvod and Peulan, wrote, literature in the native tongue was known to him. Were Taliessin, Aneirin, and others mere names at that time, because poems are, afterwards, falsely ascribed to them? Many scholars have to a greater or less extent dealt with this question. Our object, however, in this investigation is not linguistic, but rather the simpler, if more difficult one of deciding whether there is evidence in the familiar use of religious terms by any writers that the Church, let us say, of Saint David, Gildas, and Samson ministered to the common people in a language which they understood?

A beginning was made in 1849 by Mr. Thomas Stephens in his *Literature of the Kymry* to deal with the question of the dates of poems, &c., generally regarded as of very early origin. His edition of the *Gododin*, and other supplemental works, were valuable contributions in the same direction. Mr. Stephens dates them late. An extreme position was taken by Mr. D. W. Nash in his *Taliessin, or the Bards and Druids of Great Britain*, who thinks that they are of late origin. But Mr. Skene in his *Four Ancient Books of Wales* adopts a more conservative point of view than Mr. Stephens. His second volume gives a critical text of the poetry in question, which had for long been attributed to Taliessin, Aneirin, Llywarch Hen, Merddin or Merlin, and others. They have been published from time to time separately, but for most readers are more accessible in the *Myvyrian Archaeology*, and partly in Rhys Jones's *Beirdd Cymry* (1772), which contains poems purporting to be by Aneirin, Llywarch Hen, Taliessin, and, as he asserts, of the sixth century.

Even those who maintain a great antiquity for some of these productions allow that their language has undergone changes at the hands of transcribers who were, probably, themselves poets, but assert that leading words, and particularly the ideas they express, probably remain substantially the same as when the poems were first composed. Nor must linguistic criticism be allowed too easily to discredit their genuineness. The terms may have been in *oral* use for

many generations before their literary use by some author whose employment of them gives rise to the critic's doubts as to their antiquity. The poetry in question—songs, lyrics, elegies of princes and warriors, aphorisms and mystic effusions—may be, in form, the last links of a chain that reaches back far beyond the twelfth century. They make one deep impression upon our minds, namely, that they add immensely to the historian's knowledge of personages and characters who bear thoroughly British names, and who, at least the majority of them, must be historical. The sixth and seventh centuries stand forth with a great throng renowned for their illustrious saints and confessors. Our hearts cannot but be deeply touched, for theirs was a time of tears and suffering, nay, even of death, which could not fail to leave its mark, so that a genuine expression of those awful agonies can still be read in their literary remains, revised though they probably were in later times. Reading these productions, we cannot fail to mark afresh how close was the connexion between the British people all along the western shores from the southern sea to the Clyde. It is seen in the early coming of Gildas as a youth from Alclud on the Clyde to Llanilltud in South Wales, in the flight of St. Kentigern from the Lammermuirs to the Elwy, in many mournful elegies and battle-songs, such as Arderydd and Cattraeth.

The close alliance of princes and kings from Wales and the Mersey, over Cumberland, to the two walls, and across Northumberland and Yorkshire to the sea, is made plain in these poems.[1] Here, I repeat, wild criticism, and doubts for which there is no sure foundation, must be guarded against, since too easy doubt is no less misleading than too easy belief. Even if only a part of these productions be genuine, out of a superabundance of British names which meet us at every turn, a few, very few in reality, are men of the Church. yet in verse after verse of these old bards there are British expressions of religious conceptions, and allusions to religious rites and usages, all deserving of notice on our part.

The poems called *Avallenau* and *Hoianau's* are well

[1] Cf. *Wales and the Britons of the North*, by Prof. Anwyl, reprinted from the *Celtic Review* of October, 1907, and January, 1908.

known; both Stephens and Skene are agreed on their late date. They belong, the former to the beginning of the twelfth century, the latter to the end of it.[1] The language itself conclusively proves to a reader that these dates are the earliest possible for the *terminus a quo*.

Another poem, the *Cyvvessi Myrddin a Gwendyd y Chwaer*[2] (in which, by way of dialogue between the two, many princes of North Wales are introduced, among others Owain Gwynedd, whose death occurred in 1171), may also be passed by. There is great difference of opinion as to a poem which consists of a *Dialogue between Myrddin and Taliessin*[3] and apparently bears the stamp of a genuine antiquity, and may be as early as the sixth or seventh century. Granting this, in spite of the strange anachronism as to Maelgwn, who could not have led any host at the battle of Arderydd (*c.* 573), the poem yields nothing of note for the main purpose of the present work. Very different would the result be were it possible to prove that the so-called *Dialogue between Merddin and Yscolan*, and especially the poem which follows it, are genuine productions of the seventh century.[4] Mr. Skene entitles both *Poems relating to Yscolan*, but it should be observed that Merddin is not mentioned in either, nor Yscolan in the second. Several poems in the *Red Book of Hergest* are attributed to Llywarch Hen. One is tempted to regard him as an ecclesiastic, because *hen* may be in meaning, as it is in form, the equivalent of *sen-* in *sen-ex* or *sen-ior*, and so may correspond to the old term *senior*, with its ecclesiastical meaning of presbyter. If so, Llywarch,

[1] Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, vol. i, p. 370; vol. ii, p. 18 (cf. ib. i. 482, ii. 21); *Black Book of Caermarthen* (Evans, 1902), pp. 48 and 53. A deep debt is due from all students to Skene for the texts and notes given in vol. ii, a reference to which will always mean a reference to the original text.

[2] Skene, i. 462; ii. 218.

[3] Skene, i. 368; ii. 3; *Black Book of Caermarthen*, p. 1. The idea of an identification of Neuter with Dumbarton, on which a claim for antiquity is built, has, of late, been exploded. See *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, 1907. The text gives the form *Myrtin*; twice it has *Mirtin*.

[4] *Black Book of Caerm.*, pp. 81–5; Skene, i. 518–19; ii. 42–3; Stephens, *Literature of the Kymry*, pp. 211–12.

after a youth of warfare, became later in life a presbyter of the Church, and for that reason was called Llywarch Hen. From the historical poems attributed to him in the *Red Book of Hergest*, where the current expressions suggest an eyewitness, Skene concludes that he 'must have lived through the period extending from the death of Urien to that of Cadwallon in 659'. Mr. Stephens also infers that 'the poems of Llywarch Hen are undoubtedly old'.[1]

In the text of the Harleian MS., as printed by Skene, Llywarch is placed among 'The men of the North'—Gwyr y Gogledd,[2] where he appears as cousin of Uryen (Urien) and descendant of Coel Hen. The conjecture made above and based on the appellation *hen*, may appear to be shaken to some extent by the attribution of the same epithet to Coel and Dyfnwal here and in the Pedigrees. Another person similarly styled, Ridderch Hen, is far more frequently found as Riderch Hael, while Pawl Hen is almost certainly used for Paulus or Paulinus senior, i.e. presbyter. The Llanvor with which Llywarch is connected, as suggested in some late verses, might be anywhere, since its early meaning was simply Llan vawr in the sense of *lanna magna*, a large structure. Besides the passages, numerous as they are, descriptive of war, there seems to be a deep undercurrent of the reflective or brooding tendency in his poetry; he is observant of nature and describes his impressions of it, yet always returns to the ethics of life, or some religious reflection. Let us take a line or two—

Nyt atwna Duw ar a wnel
Cas dyn yman yw cas Duw vry.
God will not undo what He is doing.
What man hates here God hates above.

[1] *Four A. Books*, i. 235; *Lit. of the Kymry*, p. 10.

[2] Hengwrt MS. 536, with the title: Bonhed Gwyr y Gogled yw hyn; This is the Lineage of the Men of the North.

Uryen mab Kynnarch mab Meirchawm mab Gorust.

Ledlwm mab Keneu mab Coel.

Llywarch Hen mab Elidyr Lydanwyn mab Meirchawn mab Gorust Ledlwm mab Keneu mab Coel.

Then come four sons of Kynnwyt Kynnwydyon a generation younger, also going back to Coel. Skene, *Four Anc. Books of Wales*, ii, p. 454.

I have taken these almost at random, but not far from them are the unforgettable words—

1. Kynn bum kein *vaglawc*, bum kyffer eiryawc.
2. Kynn bum kein vaglawc bum hy,
   am kynnwyssit yg Kyuyrdy
   Powys paradwys Gymry.[1]

1. Before I was fair cleric, I had part
   In prayerful confession.
2. Before I was fair cleric I was bold,
   I was harboured in the convent-house (?)
   Of Powys, the Paradise of Wales.

Pughe and Carnhuanawc, in explanation of *vaglawc*, quoted in Skene, 'Before I appeared with crutches': 'Before I became hoary-headed and crutch-supported', and Skene himself in his text: 'I was formerly fair of limb', seem completely oblivious of the existence of *baclawc* or *balawc* as a British term for cleric; to-day the parish *priest* in Brittany is called *baelec*, *belec*.

Mr. Stephens's admiration for the *Gododin* of Aneirin is great, but in every way just. It is a song of battle, conceived in the spirit of epic poetry, describing the ruinous day of Cattraeth, and has a sublimely fine moral ring in its wail of woe over the drunkenness which sealed the doom of the Britons who then fought and failed. The name Gododid has met us in the 'Manau of the Gododin', whence Cuneda of old had come to Wales. The *Otadeni* (Ptolemy's *Οταδῖνοι*) dwelt in those northern parts, stretching south from the Lothians.[2]

Aneirin himself is sometimes styled 'son of Caw', as Gildas is, but the attempt to identify the two, as well as Stephens's efforts to find in him a son of Gildas, betray an entire misconception both of the times and of Gildas himself. The poet was evidently one of those Northern Britons whose close relations with Wales are seen in the Life of

[1] *Four A. B. of Wales*, i, 326; ii, 259.

[2] 'Otadinoi, Otalini, in Brittanien, in einem Teile von Lothian, welsch Gododin und Guotodin,' Holder, *Alt-celtischer Sprachschatz*.

Kentigern, but the poem itself seems clearly to contradict[1] Stephens's contention that he was a 'priest' in his 'rôle of bard' or among those who in their relapse into heathenism had driven away Kentigern.

The date of the poet and the poem must be deduced solely from internal evidence afforded by the poem itself. It is inferred that Aneirin was contemporary with the sons of Llywarch Hen, one of whom he mentions (xlvi),[2] with the British king Ceredig, who died in 616, with Mynyddog, but also, most significant of all, with Taliessin.

Mi na vi, Aneirin,	I, Aneirin, will do
Ys gwyr Talyessin,	As Taliessin knows,
Oveg Kywrenhin,	Who participates in my design
Neu cheing e Ododin	He will not sing a Gododin
Kynn gwawr dyd dilin.	Before the dawn bring in the coming day.

The battle seems to have taken place soon after 600, and the poem will, to some extent, help us to understand what British Christianity was at the time when Augustine was beginning his apostolic labours in Kent. The *Gododin*, which has many difficulties both of words and grammar, as Celtic scholars acknowledge, and may have undergone changes in the course of many transcriptions, remains, notwithstanding, a monument of the time when the fight of the faithful was against the heathen for the possession of Deivyr or Deira.

For our purpose the other poems, the *Gwarchen* or *Gorchan* of Tudvwlch, of Adebon, of Cynvelyn and of Maelderw, contribute hardly anything except the already quoted reference in the fourth to Enlli.

Of Taliessin there are many short pieces, mostly of the lyric type, to which a very early date is given by Stephens, Skene, and others. The bard in the legendary *Hanes Tali-*

[1] Stanza lxxx certainly does not imply this heathenism: 'Aberth am goelkerth a disgynnyn.'

[2] Keneu vab Llywarch, dihauarch, drut.
Keneu, son of Llywarch, intrepid, daring.

essin is the son of Tegid Voel and his wife Ceridwen, whose estate lay in the midst of Llyn Tegid (Bala Lake). Because of his ugliness the mother endeavoured, by incantations, to change his features. These failing to make him beautiful through the neglect of Guion Bach to attend duly to the magic cauldron (pair Ceridwen), the child assumed many forms.[1] A more tangible account is found in the verses on Urien Rheged.

As Aneirin was of the North Britons (Gwyr y Gogledd), so Taliessin belonged to the Britons of Wales, though, like others, drawn sometime to the court of Urien, King of Rheged (Rigidunum), and witnessed his strenuous fight against the Angles of Bryneich or Bernicia. 'Against him (Hussa) there fought four kings—Urien (Urbeghen, Urbgen, Urjen), Rhydderch Hen or Hael, Gwallawc, and Morcant.' This is the epoch in which to place the Life of Taliessin, and we know that he was acquainted with Aneirin, though in all likelihood considerably younger. His active life may have begun before 610, if that be the date of the *Gododin*, but must have continued long after. Yet the linguistic style, the vocabulary, and the phrases he uses would be many generations older than himself. As the list given below shows, he celebrates Urien above all others, but the son Owen is also mourned in an elegy. If the poem on p. 102 of the *Black Book of Caermarthen,* addressed to Ugnach, be Taliessin's, he is then coming from Caer Lev, and journeying to Gwidion, that strange mysterious prince of Gwynedd, or North Wales.

It is to him that the greatest number of poems is ascribed, but of these the probably genuine are exceedingly few. Of the *Book of Taliesin*, as of the *Red Book*, it is rightly held that the various poems are the products of very different epochs. A small minority is far older than the majority,

[1] *Myvyrian Archaeology*, p. 22:

A wun eu henw, Aneirin Gwawtryd awenyd,
Minneu Dalyessin o iawn llyn Geirionyd! (another reading—o lan).

Do I know his name, Aneirin Gwawrdrydd, the poet,
And I Taliessin from the Borders of Geirionydd Lake!
(Skene, i, p. 343; ii, p. 293.)

some of which belong to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. It is quite possible, one might say probable, that terms and phrases of a far more ancient period have been preserved intact in the voluminous literature of the period, A.D. 800–1200, and only await utilization for our purposes. But let the reader bear in mind that the present writer makes deductions from them in the sense of *probabilities*, but does not pretend to have established *incontestable facts*.

Mr. Stephens reduces the early poems among those assigned to Taliessin to the following twelve:

Gwaith Gwenystrad,	Battle of Gwenystrad.
Gwaith Argoed Llwyvain,	Battle of Argoed Llwyvain.
Gwaith Dyffryn Gwarant,	Battle of Dyffryn Gwarant.
I Urien,	To Urien.
I Urien,	To Urien.
Canu i Urien,	Song to Urien.
Yspail Taliessin,	The spoils of Taliessin.
Canu i Urien Rheged,	Song to Urien Rheged.
Dadolwch Urien Rheged,	Reconciliation to Urien Rheged.
I Wallawg,	To Gwallawg.
Dadolwch i Urien,	Reconciliation to Urien.
Marwnad Owain ap Urien,	Elegy of Owen son of Urien.[1]

To these he adds in the Appendix of his *Gododin*, *Marwnad Cunedda*, removing it from the list of 'doubtful' poems, and *Marwnad Aeddon o Fon* from the Mabinogi of Taliessin. that is the Elegy of Cunedda, the Elegy of Aeddon of Anglesey. Though one cannot but admire the touching beauty of scores of verses, amid a host of lines extremely difficult to understand, yet the above list of fourteen poems must, for our special purpose, be still further reduced. There are, however, some striking allusions in some of them which will demand notice.

[1] *Lit. of the Kymry*, p. 282.

Within the period discussed in the present sketch, a period which makes no pretence at exactness, it may be found that at a time later than Gildas, but earlier than the earliest narrative of Nennius, Christian poets used words and phrases which illustrate the ever increasing tendency to employ the native tongue as an instrument for the propagation of Christian ideas among the people of Britain. There were even before Gildas's own time sacred songs in which *all* could join, as he suggests (c. 34), and there would be many more before Nennius. It is quite possible that scribes have changed the phraseology and style as age succeeded age, yet a remnant will still remain in attestation that men generally (let us hope, the poor) 'had the gospel preached unto them', and were taught in their own language.

Caius Vettius Aquilinus Iuvencus wrote a *Historia Evangelica*, consisting of four books, in heroic verse, during the time of Constantine, i.e. c. 330. The work became very popular, and was frequently referred to. He is said by Jerome (*De Viris Illustribus*, c. 84) to have been a Spaniard and presbyter. His Paraphrase of the Gospel History was, in course of time, brought to Britain, and a transcription of it is contained in a MS. belonging to the University Library, Cambridge. The Cambridge MS. was copied by a British writer, whose name seems to have been Nuada, because the colophon ends with what probably is a desire for prayer in British—*Araut dinuadu*, which in modern Welsh would be *Arawd i Nuaddu*, prayer for Nuaddu, *araut*, or the later *arawd*, being a British form of *oratio*, Irish *oroit*, in the sense of prayer. Such expressions are very common at the end of MSS. But this colophon has another point of some interest for us. The scribe was acquainted with the *De Viris Illustribus* of Jerome, since the third line reproduces, with only a change of case and tense, the very words of the notice in Jerome. The scribe's verses run:

expliqunt quattuor evangelia
a Juvenco presbytero
pene ad verbum translato.
araut dinuadu,

and the words of the *De Viris Illustribus* seem to be found in them: 'presbyter . . . paene ad verbum transferens.'[1]

The MS. contains many interesting glosses, which have received much attention from Celtic scholars, but there are also verses in the British language written in the same hand as the glosses, which have seriously taxed the learning of translators. The verses themselves, it should be remembered, may have been copied from a poet far older than the one who inserted them in their present context, and not well versed in the British tongue.

A few terms of theological interest and indicative of church ritual may be found in this ancient writing, which it cannot be wrong to regard as considerably older than the MS. itself. I cull out of what is recognized as extremely difficult to understand, the following:—

betid: the word is now *bedydd*; its change from *baptizo* or *baptismum* through Low Latin *bat-* is somewhat curious.

trintaut, trinity; now we have *trindawd* or *trindod*, in which we trace the Latin *trinitat-em* (cf. p. 305).

Molim map meir: the first word is a form of a word still used, i.e. *moli* and *mawl*, in the sense of *praise*. *Map Meir*, son of Mary, appears early in Latin sacred poetry, e.g. the following from Sedulius, the Irish presbyter, who lived under Theodosius (i.e. before A.D. 395):—

> Christum canamus principem,
> Natum Maria uirgine.
> (Hymnus ii, *Mon. Germ. Hist.* vol. iv.)

The appellation *map Meir* represents this *natus Maria*, which came into general use with the reverence paid to the Virgin Mary in the Latin Church from a time before Jerome, and found its way to Britain.

[1] See *De Viris Illustribus*, c. 84. The best text of Iuvencus is published in vol. xxiv of *C. Script. Eccl. Lat.*, edited by Huemer.

See also Skene, *Four Ancient Books of Wales*, vol. ii, pp. 1, 2, and 311–14, for the British verses. He connects the original codex with the monastery of Llangarvan.

The *Book of Aneirin* (Skene, vol. ii) furnishes the following:

(*a*) Can drindawt en undawt gyuan, p. 72.
(*b*) Pelerdyr pwys preiglyn benn periglawr, p. 86.
(*c*) Ked elwynt e lannau e benydyaw, p. 64.
E benydu, on the same page.
(*d*) A llanvawr llawn annawd em bedyd, p. 65.

Which may be rendered as follows:—

(*a*) By Trinity in perfect Unity.
(*b*) Shaft heavy as the crozier of a chief priest.
(*c*) Though they went to llans for penance.
(*d*) With a llanvawr (large church) full of desire for baptism.

Here we find the theological expression *trinitas in unitate* as *trindaut*, and even *trined* (p. 303), in common use; *periglawr* also, which may be a form of *paroec-lorius*, from *paroecia*, παροικία, and having no connexion, as has been held, with *periculosa oratio*. The *penn periglawr* might be the archipresbyter known in Western Latin churches, or possibly a bishop. The *Red Book* also has: *Pwy bu periglawr, Y uab meir mwynuawr* (Skene, vol. ii, p. 301); the same book has *penydyaw*, as well as *penyd*, or *penyt*, as in the *Black Book* (p. 79), *mawr penyd meith peunyt* (signifying 'great penance means long suffering'); *penyd* must be a form of the noun *poenitentia*, or verb *poenitet*; the Irish is *pennait*.[1]

The *Black Book of Caermarthen* has just been mentioned, and when it is examined with the special purpose we have in view, the collection of poems it has preserved will be found rich in religious terms. Some, maybe most, of the poems gathered together in the volume are comparatively late, yet the book being what it is, a kind of 'Golden Treasury' of British poetry, the expressions will, for the most part, be seen to consist of British phrases and terms for the very ideas with which the Latin literature of old authors, the Latin Scriptures, and Latin ritual of the Church had made men familiar. One feature seems clearly marked: the phraseology expressive of moral ideas—good, evil, virtue,

[1] Skene, vol. ii, p. 42.

right—is full and distinct. The old native name for God, Duw, which, as related to *divu*, and to δῖος of the Greek, implies light or splendour, is preserved in all these productions. Other appellations for God, borrowed from Latin, appear also, such as *douid*, Latin *domit-*, now Dofydd; *reen* or *ren*, probably a form of *regem* (from *rex*), meaning king;[1] *celi*, at first an attributive genitive, as Creeawdyr Celi, *Creator Caeli*, Creator of Heaven, Duw Celi, *deus caeli*, God of Heaven. So also were the others attributives originally. *Kynelu o douit* (*Black Book*, p. 18), *Ny gunaho douit drwy poen* (Skene, ii, p. 35; also p. 7 of *Black Book*), may the Lord not weaken me with pain; *Reen nef*, King of Heaven; *Y duw ren*, to God the King; *Tri trined in celi, y ssi un a thri*, three, Trinity in Celi, there are One and Three.

The character of the ordinary religious life of the period is exemplified by the following:—

(*a*) Ny. byd nac adreidyaw yr allawr
Yny dygwydho nef ar lawr (Skene, vol. ii, p. 231).
(*b*) Byw mall a gwall ar lanneu,
Gwan ffyd bob eildyd dadleu (p. 236).
(*c*) Kynarwyd yu duw ym damunet (p. 295).

In English:—

(*a*) Neither will there be seeking of altar
Until heaven come on earth.
(*b*) Evil life and defection in churches,
Faith weak, alternate days of disputing.
(*c*) Known to God is my desire.

These extracts, in their present form, may be late poetry of the tenth to twelfth centuries, yet employing words centuries older than themselves, as has been so often said. The following conception of St. Peter is found even in Gildas, as in other writers. The other lines quoted also represent a tendency which was active when Dewi and Gildas were preaching.

[1] See Skene, vol. ii, pp. 10-16; *Bl. Book*, pp. 29-40; English translation in Skene, vol. i, pp. 508-15.

(*a*) Caraw voli Pedyr a vedir tagtew.
I love to praise Peter who can bring peace
(Skene, vol. ii, p. 36).

(*b*) Naut meir gwiri ar gueriton.
Protection of the Virgin Mary and the virgins
(Ibid).

(*c*) Oret y duw buw budyeu
Am byd ryd radeu
Drwy eiryawl seinheu (Skene, vol. ii, p. 300).
Pray to the living God for benefits
Reaching to the state of free gifts,
By intercession of saints.

It would be tedious to continue this collection of extracts, but the inference seems conclusive that at an early period the native language of Britain had gone through a process which made it a fitting instrument for the expression of religious thought and feeling.

From a long list a few others may be culled :—

Croes Crist, the cross of Christ.
Cristaun, *Cristyaun*, Christian.
Gwyn y vyt yr eneit ae harobryn, blessed is the soul that merits it.
Eidolyd, worshipper.
Dysgogan derwyd, implying the persistence of divination.
Gwaxt godolaf vedyd, praise of baptism.
Rodyion bedyd, gifts of baptism.
Byn gweryd, before the grave.
Un duw uchaf dewin (divinus) *doethaf*, one God of highest knowledge and wisdom.
Poet ef a rodo rann gobeith, may He give His portion of hope.
Cymun, Communion.
Plwyf offeirieit, priest's congregation or parish.
Pirth y wlat nef, gates to the heavenly country.
Y maur drugaruc duw, the great merciful God.
Nyt gwaeth urd o dynn noc urd o eglwys, not worse Order from man than Order from Church.
Escop, pl. *escyp*, bishop.

These extracts show that the church organization and theology of Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine found a home, not only in the Churches of Britain, but also in the native language of its people at an early time.

Quite a theological statement of the doctrine of redemption, as taught in the theology of the Latin Fathers of the Church, appears in the following lines :—

Guledic detuit an gurel in rit erbin dit brawt
An duch ir gulet fry varet ac werindaut.
Ym paraduis im pur kynnuis rac puis pechaud
An gunel iechid iry penid ac pimp dirnaud.
Dolur eghirith. Duw am diffirch ban kymirth cnaud
Din a collei bei nasprinhei diuei devaud.
Or croc crevled y deuth guared ir vedissyaud.
Kadarn bugeil Crist nid adweil y teilygdaud.

May the blessed Ruler make us free before the day of judgement.
May He bring us to the places above through His meekness;
Into paradise may He fully take us freed from the burden of sin.
May He save us by His agony and five wounds.
Great the suffering. God delivered us when He took flesh.
Man was lost, may due usage not fail him.
From the cruel cross came salvation to the world ;
Strong shepherd, Christ, His merit shall not fail.

(*Black Book*, pp. 40, 41 ; Skene, ii, p. 13 ; English Tr. i, p. 512.)

A few—there are not many—extracts might be taken from a prose work of which the date is approximately known. The *Laws of Howel the Good* must be earlier than 950, the date of Howel's death. They are found in three recensions, which Aneurin Owen, the editor of the Rolls Series edition, styles Venedotian, Gwentian, and Dimetian Codes. The prefaces to these appear to be considerably later than the *Laws* themselves, and even in the body of the text such a

phrase as *Na manach na braut*, neither monk nor friar, betrays the thirteenth century.[1]

Yet no small part of these Laws is generally regarded as very old in origin, and ecclesiastical terms which may well belong to the original structure of the older material are met with. Of such are *effeiriat* and *offeirat*, *efferen*, priest, mass, from the Latin verb *offerre*; *eglwys*, *ecclesia*; with a distinct *periglawr*, cleric; *allawr*, altar; *penytio*, to do penance.

Words such as have been quoted, many of them more ancient than the books they appear in, exemplify what has been stated in a previous chapter. Currents of popular thought and feeling run their course, past the previously accepted language, especially in liturgical passages laden with figurative terms; the people advanced beyond the original mystic and spiritual meaning. Figure became reality as the enshrined idea which it was intended to convey by custom and tradition was moulded for the ages to come. The Faith in Britain was the faith of Western Europe generally; its Church had the same organization of ministers, in which bishops and presbyters became priests (sacerdotes); the Lord's Table[2] an altar; to these bishops belong the power of binding and loosing. Behind all was the wonderfully powerful force of monachism.

We observe in Britain a moderate, perhaps rude, growth of the idea of churchliness, the importance of orthodoxy, and the performance of church duties, of worship, prayer, observance of feast and fast days, personal fasting, almsgiving (*maur y kinnit ar y cardaut*). These are features of the times coeval with Gildas and Dewi Sant, and in especial the times which succeeded them.

Along with all the similarity mentioned there was, nevertheless, in Britain ample material to cause disruption if changes were pressed or haughtily demanded in customs handed down from a remote antiquity. There remained also to be counted with a temper of mind reared in a long life under these usages.

[1] I use along with the Rolls edition that of the Rev. A. W. Wade-Evans (1909), a vast improvement.

[2] The scriptural name Lord's Table lasted in common use for centuries side by side with the term 'altar'.

CHAPTER XXV

TWO CHURCHES

I

Christianity in Britain has been represented as beginning about A.D. 180–200 by the immigration of Christian believers from Gaul and other Western countries. 'The few scattered individuals of that remote time, with their small and sparse communities, practising Church rites in their simplest forms, guided by their *episcopi*, along with other *doctores* from among local craftsmen or men of the professional class, grew to be a great multitude. Their Church extended throughout the land. After an existence of about four hundred years, it had experienced an evolution which had brought it treasures of dogma and exegesis, of ceremony and customs, with numerous monastic institutions, homes of evangelizing work and strict ascetic morals.

According to the only record we possess, the last correspondence of any kind between the Bishop of Rome and this Church was in the year 454,[1] when Britain as well as Gaul and Spain acquiesced in the change recommended by St. Leo the Great in the observance of Easter Day. Nothing more is known. But a new intercourse began some seven score years later, as another great Bishop of Rome sent forth a Benedictine prior, 'and with him divers other monks who feared the Lord, to preach the word of God to the English nation.' 'He saved our nation,' Beda says of St. Gregory, 'from the teeth of the old enemy by the preachers he sent hither, and made it partaker of eternal liberty.' After the conversion of Kent there was in our island a Church which will best be called Anglo-Roman. Certain ideas and conceptions which were dominant in it

[1] See Ch. XXIII, end.

were decidedly Roman, as was natural. Within the British portion proper of the island—among the Celts—there was the old native Church which, since the Council of Arles (314), or at latest since the time of Theodosius (395), had lived on its life in comparative seclusion. There had been occasional communion with continental Churches, but what the Church of Britain may have possessed of administrative rule was carried on entirely within itself. Many old customs also continued, cherished and revered by all the people in Western parts, from the neighbourhood of the West Saxons on the southern coast to the Tyne and the Clyde on the north. But there were no 'two Churches' until after A.D. 603.

St. Augustine, 'the apostle of England,' eager, active and high-minded as he was, struck out on a wrong path in 603, and caused a division between the English and the British Churches, which lasted until the beginning of the ninth century. There came then a partial unity in North Wales, and, after a time, in South Wales, but it took another century for it to establish itself in Devon and Cornwall.[1] It is this division which causes us to speak of two Churches. Before a separation which resulted in the one Church calling the other *non-Catholic*, and which provoked a feeling of extreme bitterness, the men who have been noticed in these pages as pre-eminently disciples of Illtud were all dead. Still it was to the Britain which Dewi Sant, Gildas, Samson, Teilo and their immediate followers had recalled to fresh spiritual activity that Augustine and his companions came. Of this fact he was probably in ignorance; had he known of it, his attitude might have been different.

Though the revived monachism held a predominant place among those Britons, it can in no way be identified with the Church as an organized body. As such the Church was a community with customs and ways of church life widely

[1] The Picts conformed to Anglo-Roman usages in 710, the monastery on the island of Hi in 716. I am not now referring to the separate administrative existence which lasted until Norman influence began to assert itself in Wales in the eleventh century.

different from church life as understood at Rome,—Rome, that home of great ecclesiastical changes in the course of its wonderful career of development, that Church of great bishops, from Damasus to Leo the Great, from Leo to Gregory the Great, that centre of Western Christianity with its Primacy secured and well defined in many countries, and potent even where not formally defined or even recognized. By the time when a Roman ecclesiastic met British bishops, there had been a century and a half of sanguinary war between the Saxons, or English—as yet heathen—and the native Britons, a war that was still continuing in Southern and Northern Britain. Every one, consequently, can well understand and freely condone the bitter words in which the invaders are spoken of by British writers from Gildas downwards. It is mentioned here as a fact to be kept in mind when the *colloquium* or conference which took place in 603 between Augustine and certain bishops of the British is discussed. There also existed in the northern parts of Britain, at that time, what may be termed another Church. This was the Church of the Scoti or Irish, and Picts, most closely conforming with the Church of the Britons in characteristic ideas and customs, chiefly through the teaching and guidance, in the first place, of Britons such as Gildas, David, Docus and many others. Nynias at an early period had succeeded in converting the Southern Picts to the Christian faith. This is the testimony of Beda.[1] But many remains and local names at this day also supply the same evidence for Northern Pictland.[2] The Irish Church, however, came into closer contact with the Picts after the founding of the celebrated monastery at Hi (or Iona) by St. Columba, a man whose direct relation with the Church of Britain in the person of Gildas and David is traced through his teacher, St. Finnian of Clonard.

It was by missionaries from that monastery, and from the Irish Church, that the evangelization of North-

[1] *Hist. Eccles.* iii. 4.

[2] *The Scottish Historical Review*: Article on Nynias in Northern Pictland, by the Rev. Archibald Black Scott, M.A., p. 878.

umbria, Mercia, and Mid-Anglia was carried on from the time of Oswald to the Synod of Whitby. Beda carefully describes their customs as essentially, and even wrongly, different from those of the Anglo-Roman Church, yet most fairly and loyally acknowledges their worth and service. The three bishops, Aidan, Finan and Colman, were to him members of another Church than his own, though they laboured successfully in the conversion of the English for thirty years,[1] rekindling the flame that had almost died away after the flight of Paulinus of York. They even consecrated bishops for the English Church, though themselves as much non-Catholics as the Britons, according to Beda's views.

From the year 603 *there were two Churches in Britain*, the old British, the new Roman. That chasm which separated them was first of all made by the precipitate action of the very missionary who had been the first to bring the faith in Christ to the Saxons.

Though the whole story has been often told, it will be necessary to look afresh at what took place in the conference (*colloquium*) held between Augustine and the representatives of the Britons 'at a place which to this day', as Beda narrates, 'is called in the English language Augustinaes Ac, that is, Augustine's Oak (*robur Augustini*), on the borders of the Hwiccas and West Saxons'. The only authority for the proceedings of the *colloquium* is Beda, and it is but fair to take into account his strong animus against the Britons, as a people who 'to this day despise the faith and religion of the English' (ii. 20), who do 'many other things', besides refusing to celebrate Easter at the right time, 'against the purity and peace of the Church' (v. 18). To him, the Britons were 'heretics who had despised the offer of eternal salvation' (ii. 2), their Church and bishops non-Catholic (iii. 29), their morals wicked (v. 23).

In 601 Augustine had been constituted archbishop, and to him as such Gregory the Great declared subject not only those bishops whom he himself should ordain, or those that

[1] Beda, *H. E.* iii. 5–26.

should be ordained by the Bishop of York, *but also all the priests of Britain*.[1] All these were to 'learn the rule of right belief and right living from the words and life of his Holiness'—the archbishop himself. We may apply the last clause to the British bishops alone, and so find in the very words of the great Pope an intimation of the changes that were about to be demanded of the Britons. In that case, the teaching and practice of an English archbishop duly authorized by Rome were henceforth to be the rule of belief and religious life for the old native Church. This demand was absolute.

If the *colloquium* or conference was held in 603,[2] soon after the archbishop had received his 'Answers' from Gregory, there was at that time no bishop besides himself in the English Church. It may well be that his chief object was the laudable one of taking the earliest opportunity possible to enlist the aid of the native Church in 'the evangelization of the heathen for the Lord's sake'. A hard task, every one will confess, when, after the bloody and fateful battle of Deorham in 577, the Saxon invaders occupied such important towns as Bath, Cirencester and Gloucester, and before long other places also, ruthlessly destroying churches in the valley of the Severn.[3]

[1] *Hist. Eccl.* i. 29 'Tua vero fraternitas non solum eos episcopos quos ordinaverit, neque hos tantummodo qui per Eburacae episcopum fuerint ordinati, sed etiam omnes Brittaniae sacerdotes habeat Deo Domino nostro Iesu Christo auctore subiectos: quatenus ex lingua et vita tuae sanctitatis et recte credendi et bene vivendi formam percipiant.'

[2] Gregory's Answer to the Sixth Question strongly confirms this view. Beda, ii. 2, gives no date, only *Interea*; if the *colloquium* took place in 604, Mellitus and Justus *may* have been ordained, and there would then be three English bishops; ibid. ii. 3.

[3] The deep wail of grief heard in the British *Marwnad* (Elegy of) *Cynddylan*, whether the poem be of the end of the sixth century or not, must be expressive of the feeling of the Britons about A.D. 600. The poem is attributed to Llywarch Hen in his old age, who represents himself, along with certain escaped women, as beholding the ruin of his country, probably from the Wrekin. The very churches (Egluysseu Bassa) had been destroyed.

Sefych allan, vorynnion, a syllych
werydre Gyndylan;

The proposal was a hard one at the time when the Saxons were pursuing their conquests, but it was worse still presented to the Britons without the amenities expected, in a tactless, imperious way, which tended to produce aggravation and irritation. He began with 'persuasion and brotherly admonition that they should hold Catholic peace with him'. This call, so emphatically made, to extend and preserve the Catholic peace (*catholica pax*) carried with it the expression of a censure of the Britons themselves, as men who 'preferred their own traditions to all the Churches which agree in Christ throughout the world'. Entreaties, exhortations, rebukes were all tried, yet tried in vain, the contention proving troublesome and stubborn. A miracle was challenged, which, as might be expected, turned out plainly favourable to Augustine. Still the Britons, though impressed by the blind man receiving his sight, were unconvinced; they could not depart, they stated, from their ancient customs without the consent and authority of their people. The first day of the conference ended with no result but an agreement to hold another meeting.

When they met again on the appointed day, there were seven British bishops, and many learned men, chiefly from the famous monastery of Bangor-is-y-Coed, where Dunawd was at that time abbot. They may have met at Urbs Legion, that is, at Chester on the Dee.[1]

Llys Penn-gwern neut tande ?
Gwae ieueinc a eidun brotro.

Stand forth, maidens, and survey
the land of Cynddylan,
Pengwern's palace, is it not in flames ?
Woe to the youth that longs for fellowship.

See Dr. Guest's *Origines Celticae*. English Conquest of the Severn Valley, pp. 289-301; here the *Red Book* text of the *Marwnad* is given, with a translation.

Referring to Cynddylan, the poem says:—

Cledyr cat, callon Argoetwis.

Steadfast in battle, heart of the men of Argoed.

It need hardly be said that *Pengwern* is the British for Shrewsbury (Shrubs-burgh), and *Argoed* (Woodland) for Shropshire.

[1] The *Annales Cambriae* places a Sinodus Urbis Legion (*sic*) and the

'They that were about to go to the aforesaid council,' so the story is told by Beda, 'betook themselves first to a certain holy and discreet man who was wont to lead an anchorite life among them, asking whether they ought at the preaching of Augustine to abandon their traditions.' The hermit's answer was, that if Augustine was a man of God, they should follow him; when questioned further how they were to know this, the test offered by the solitary was that of humility; but how again were they to decide whether he was humble? 'Do you contrive,' he said, 'that he with his followers is first to arrive at the place of meeting (*ad locum synodi*), and if, as you approach, he rises up to meet you, with the knowledge that he is a servant of Christ, hear him willingly; but if he despise you, and does not choose to rise up before you, since you are more in number, let him also be despised by you.' One feels that Beda the Venerable, notwithstanding his prejudices, certainly relished this account. But what is of moment in the whole narrative is on the one hand the gravity and judgement with which the Britons approached the problem set before them, and on the other, their choice of moral and religious tests respecting the archbishop and the claims he advanced. The question of metropolitan authority was something they could not understand; to Augustine with the ideas of his Church, it was everything. He had inquired of Gregory: 'How are we to deal with the bishops of Gaul and Britain?' Gregory answers: 'We give you no authority over bishops of Gaul. . . . But as for the bishops of Britain, we commit them all to your care.'[1] Augustine, naturally swayed by the prerogatives of Rome, by the primacy of its bishop, set this as a claim before a Church whose bishops were numerous even when Gildas

death of Gregory in the same entry, under A. D. 601. The year is wrong for Gregory's death, but his death followed soon after the conference. The collocation may well imply the fact stated in the text, especially as we know the annalist's leanings.

[1] Beda, *H. E.* i. 27: 'vii. Interrogatio Augustini: Qualiter debemus cum Galliarum Brittaniarumque episcopis agere? Respondit Gregorius: In Galliarum episcopis nullam tibi auctoritatem tribuimus . . . Brittaniarum vero omnes episcopos tuae fraternitati committimus.'

wrote some sixty years previously. What he expected was submission to formal authority; what they did was to form their judgement of him by signs of spiritual fitness. They had had no experience of the *authority* pure and simple of an archbishop as set forth in the metropolitan system.

The archbishop, at this second gathering, brought forward definite proposals. 'In many things ye do what is contrary to our custom, nay rather to the custom of the Church Universal, and yet if you are willing to comply with me in these three matters, that is, that you celebrate Easter at its time, that you complete the ministry of Baptism by which we are born anew, according to the custom of the holy Roman and Apostolic Church, and join us in preaching the word of the Lord to the English nation, we will tolerate all the other things you do, though contrary to our custom.' These words of Augustine, along with his haughty attitude and contemptuous treatment of the recalcitrant Britons, alienated the British Church, and it is this fact which makes it necessary in this work to speak of 'two Churches' in Britain. The answer returned to him was clear: 'they would do none of these things, nor would they regard him as archbishop;' the directions of St. Gregory had come to nought; neither Augustinen or any other was destined to be this people's archbishop for three centuries.

Beda does not expressly state that the English archbishop actually made this demand for recognition and submission, yet these words, certainly, imply that it was conveyed to the Britons, and, probably, made the chief basis of his demand for a unity involving in itself the required changes. Their Church was to them the Church of St. Alban and the other martyrs, of Illtud, of Gildas, of St. David, of Samson along with a cloud of other witnesses, their own pastors and teachers. How, then, could they, at the call of one sole bishop, abandon the ways of 'right faith and good life' handed down to them by such teachers and Fathers? Thus, to repeat, came about the unhappy separation between the old Church and the new one, between British and Anglo-Roman.

It is worth while to pause to consider the readiness, the

intelligence, and the sanity of mind with which later on the venerable Irish missionaries, Aidan, Finan and Colman, accompanied by quite an army of helpers, threw themselves into the work of preaching and organizing the Church among the English of Northumbria and other parts of England far and wide. But it should be observed that the fixing of Eastertide was never put forth as a crucial test for them. They were never required to change their customs, and were allowed full liberty in their practice of them, 'being deservedly beloved by all,' as is said of Aidan, 'even by those who differed in opinion concerning Easter, and held in veneration not only by less important persons, but even by the bishops, Honorius of Canterbury and Felix of the East Angles' (Beda, *H. E.* iii. 25).

No metropolitan power was exercised to mar the work of these benefactors of Northern Britain; they were even favoured by Archbishop Honorius. One cannot but believe that an earlier work of evangelization on the part of the Britons might have taken place had Augustine observed similar moderation, or had he known, along with his other noble qualities, the wisdom of concession and breadth of view.

Describing the efforts made in 605 by Laurentius, Augustine's successor, to win the Britons, a man 'who strived to bestow his pastoral care upon the tribes of the ancient inhabitants of Britain', and wrote a letter to the British bishops, 'suitable to his degree, by which he endeavoured to confirm them in catholic unity,' Beda adds bitterly, 'but what he gained by so doing the present times still show' (ii. 4). Thus he sorrowfully wrote about 731. The Synod of Whitby led by Wilfrid in 664 made the Church of the English decidedly Roman; after the Council of Hertford, in 673, presided over by Archbishop Theodore, it developed tendencies which necessarily resulted in the condemnation of the Christianity of the British as non-Catholic; after a West-Saxon synod, Aldhelm in 705 wrote to the Britons as being 'outside the Catholic Church'. 'The precepts of your bishops,' he says, 'are not in accord with Catholic faith;'[1] *the British Church was heretical.*

[1] *Monumenta Germ. Hist., Epp.*, tom. iii. pp. 231 ff.; also Haddan and

The task still remains of investigating those 'many other things contrary to church unity' or 'contrary to Roman custom', as well as those definitely mentioned which Beda and Augustine assert to have prevailed among the Britons. This means that we have to inquire (1) why and how the Britons clung so tenaciously to their mode of computing the day on which Easter was to fall, and (2) to find the reason for the second demand of Augustine that the last act, or the completion (*ut compleatis*), in the rite of Baptism should be in accordance with the usage of the Roman Church.

One point above most, if not above all others, deserves notice here. This is the use and study of the Scriptures in Britain during the lengthy period which elapsed before the Roman missionaries arrived in Kent. We have reason to believe that acquaintance with the words of Scripture was held in high esteem among the Britons, even if the method of interpretation pursued by them had in it much that was imperfect—though imperfect in company with great Church Fathers. The second attempt at a Commentary in Latin on the Pauline Epistles was made by a British monk, no other than Pelagius, which though at an early period attributed to writers of distinction in the Church, was under his name—frequently *Pilagius*—highly valued in Ireland. I can think of no reason why the same might not have been the case in Britain; the work—valuable as a Commentary—may have been carried *to* Ireland by Gildas or David or Docus. We take Gildas, who wrote about 540, as an example of acquaintance with Scripture. He was acquainted with Jerome's *Dialogi contra Pelagianos*, written in 415, from the prologue[1] of which he quotes the substance of a striking saying, and yet nowhere, strange to say, makes mention of

Stubbs, *Councils*, vol. iii. pp. 268–73. See also *Penitential* of Theodore, c. 1, which imposes re-ordination.

[1] It is introduced by the words: 'sicut bene quidam nostrorum ait'; so also: 'ut bene quidam nostrum ait,' &c., c. 38, which appear to be taken from Jerome's *Commentary* on 1 Sam. xiii. 13, 14; and in c. 62, 'ut quidam ante nos ait,' from *Epistola* 128 *ad Gaud.* on the fall of Rome.

Pelagius or Pelagians. In any case there is ample evidence in this work, so frequently referred to, of the supreme importance attached to Scripture, by the author's use of it as almost the only authoritative basis for his denunciation of those priests who, among other evil practices, 'even forsake the very reading of God's word' (c. 98). No civic, no conciliar, no patristic, no ecclesiastical authority is invoked against them. The whole range of ideas, as they appear in the extant works of Pelagius, and as mentioned in the works of his opponents; his Letter to the Roman virgin Demetrias; the Creed which he sent to Innocent, the Bishop of Rome, and was read with approval by his successor Zosimus; the entire phraseology of St. Patrick's writings as well as that of Gildas, seem to presuppose that the great doctrines of the Christian faith—the doctrine of God, of the Trinity, of the Incarnation—as formulated in those centuries, were received also in Britain. There was, it is true, Pelagianism—a Western doctrine—taught here in the later twenties of the fifth century by men who, as described above, were victims of the severe measures adopted by Pope Caelestine. Afterwards, there came once more a sprinkling of views that had spread widely in Gaul, and were then called Pelagianism, but in later times semi-Pelagianism. The former soon disappeared; the latter, more than half Augustinian, also died away. Rome and Britain had again the same faith.

Returning to Gildas, we discover in him a real devotion for the words of Scripture, but with entire acceptance of new Church tendencies that became more pronounced and more formal in the Middle Ages. To him every bishop, we repeat, was a priest, who, it is even said, makes the offering for another, and it was to the priests alone in the Church—that is, to bishops and presbyters—that the power of binding and loosing was given; the Lord's Table became an altar; there was also prevalent in his time the religious usage named Invocation of Saints, though the content of the phrase was not fixed. This British writer does not find fault with these features of the life of the Church; they are rather taken for granted as having a real and serious meaning, from which

some had disastrously declined. But above all he is a student well versed in Holy Scripture.

As has been previously stated, a close study of the British writers of the sixth and seventh centuries reveals the fact that the intimate acquaintance with the Bible acquired in that time was an acquaintance with and use of two Latin versions. In one sense the variety of versions connected two ages. When Gildas was a youth, Jerome's version was apparently unknown in Britain, but when he wrote the *De Excidio* it had begun to find that permanent place which, eventually, it secured everywhere. Fortunately Gildas makes his extracts consecutively and twice over, once in addressing the political and judicial rulers, the second time in his denunciation of those who were, as he says, 'of his own order.' We are thus able to trace the arrangement followed by him in reading the several books of the Bible.

The Scriptural books are quoted in the *first* series, cc. 38–63, as follows:—1 and 2 Samuel, 1 Kings, 2 Chronicles; then the Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah (Joel omitted), Habakkuk, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Job, 4 Esdras (2 Esdras in the Apocrypha of English and Welsh Bibles), Ezekiel; following them, as part of Scripture, come the Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclesiasticus, both regarded as genuine works of Solomon.

In the *second* series, cc. 76–105, we have 1 Samuel, 1 Kings (2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Chronicles omitted), Isaiah, Jeremiah, Joel (Habakkuk omitted), Hosea, Amos, Micah, Zephaniah (Haggai omitted), Zechariah, Malachi (Job and Esdras omitted), Ezekiel (Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus omitted). In the first of these lists there are no books of the New Testament; in the second were added extracts from the Four Gospels, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, 1 Thessalonians, Colossians, 2 Timothy, Titus, 1 and (a second time) 2 Timothy. Taking the work as a whole we find that all the books of the Old Testament have extracts made from them—from some, as for instance, the Psalms, very copiously—except Ruth, 1 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Song of Songs, Daniel, Obadiah, Jonah,

and Nahum. Every book of the New Testament yields quotations except 2 Thessalonians, Philemon, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude.

The order of books, identical in the two series, as well as the singular position of the books of Job, Ezekiel, and Colossians imply an arrangement generally accepted in Britain, which differed widely from the order found in the Vulgate, as also from that of the leading Greek MSS. of the Septuagint. As to Job and Ezekiel, the anonymous treatise called *Speculum*,[1] in the same way, places the books of Ezekiel and Daniel (which is not quoted by Gildas) after the Minor Prophets. Cassiodorus, according to one of his lists, places Job among the last books of the Old Testament; the *Decretum Gelasii* has Job among the 'Histories'—*historiae*, and several others. But what is of far greater interest respecting Job than the position of the book is, that the extracts given by Gildas represent the Old Latin version of the Septuagint as it existed *before* Origen's *Hexapla*, i.e. before about 250. This was an abbreviated edition; Jerome calls it truncated. From seven to eight hundred lines of the book, he says, were wanting to this old translation, based on a pre-Origenian text, which before long was superseded by Jerome's own version, now called the Vulgate. Yet in Britain this ancient Latin of Job lived on to the sixth century.[2]

The singular place assigned to the Epistle to Colossians, after Thessalonians, is found also in Ambrosiaster.

Now we observe that a new influence was at work in Britain; the new Bible, or a very notable revision of the Old Latin text carried out by Jerome, was gaining general acceptance. With his version were introduced also, as has been observed, the other works of this Father. My own investigations lead me to infer that in the Old Testament Gildas had codices of this new Bible for Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, and probably Malachi, of the prophets; also, of

[1] Edited by Weirich in *C. S. E. C.* vol. xii. The *Speculum* is regarded as belonging to the eighth or ninth century.

[2] A collation may be seen on pp. 130–2 of the Cymmrodorian edition of Gildas.

the Pentateuch, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings. But, at the same time, Old Latin codices of most if not of all these. Old Latin quotations are spread over 1 Samuel and 1 Kings, then 2 Chronicles, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Ezekiel, and nine or ten others (three not being quoted), *which means the whole of the Minor Prophets*; lastly, the books left unrevised by Jerome, or only partially revised, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and 4 Esdras. Thus the larger part of the Old Testament Scriptures was generally known and used in Britain from Old Latin codices during the sixth century, and certainly before that time.[1] Even in the parts of which, when writing quotations of some length, Gildas employs the Vulgate, he lapses now and then into Old Latin; for instance, in the book of Isaiah, quoting familiar words from memory, he uses the older text.[2] Illustrations have already been given of this peculiarity. Not a few further examples might be easily adduced, as well as illustrations of the fact that different texts or renderings of the same passages were known.[3]

The peculiar character of the quotations from the Old Latin texts of the Bible, such as were in use in Britain between 500 and 550, had drawn the attention of the first

[1] I have compared the *Codex Weingartiensis* published by Ranke, 1856, 1858, 1868, 1888, as well as the readings in Tertullian, the Latin version of Irenaeus, Cyprian, Lucifer of Cagliari, and the *Speculum*. In these, especially in the *Codex Weing.*, extremely striking agreement with Gildas's quotations will be found.

[2] The same is true of St. Augustine of Hippo when quoting well-remembered passages. See Burkitt, 'St. Augustine's Bible and the *Itala*,' *Journal of Th. Studies*, Jan. 1910.

[3] For instance, Genesis v. 24 and Jer. xxxii. 39, Micah iii. 8 and Hosea viii. 4 appear in two forms, both differing from the *Speculum*; some parts of the First Book of Samuel were apparently known in three forms.

A reconstruction of the Old Latin Minor Prophets appears in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vols. v. vi, with a full 'apparatus criticus', but it is strange that the writer has not used our native Gildas. His punctuation in Hosea iii. 4 might have been different had he consulted the quotations of the Minor Prophets in Gildas's *De Excidio*, and the body of so excellent a work would be ampler. I may refer to the Cymmrodorian edition of Gildas, p. 93.

editor of Gildas, Polydore Vergil (1525), who changed them so as to conform with the Vulgate. But Joscelin, the secretary of Archbishop Parker and editor of the second edition of Gildas (1568), restored all the extracts to the form found in his MSS.

Schöll started the theory that the Greek language was known and taught in Britain, so that Gildas himself translated numerous passages of the Old and New Testament from the Greek. The study of Greek would thus be part of the work carried on in the monasteries of Britain, a course that might be explained by their probable close relation to the institutions of South Gaul. The same view is, though partially and with limitation, expressed in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*.[1] What truth is there in this hypothesis? Hardly any. The similarity of readings on which it is founded is really only the agreement of Old Latin texts, as used by Gildas, with ancient Greek codices.

We have seen that there was circulating in Britain a part of the Latin Bible resting on a text older than the *Hexapla* of Origen, *c.* 240; we have found also different renderings of the same passages, implying different codices, so that agreement or disagreement with the great Greek MSS., such as Schöll insists upon, does not count for much. The rude literalness of the Biblical passages quoted by a British writer shows, not that he ventured on a translation himself, but that he made use of very ancient *non*-corrected copies, which were nearer to the Greek than later ones.

The probable inference consequently is that in this varied employment of Old Latin copies, and of different ones even for the same passages, as well as the use of the New Version (*Nova Versio*) by Jerome, there is an indication of a strong, active, popular Church life in Britain. This inference is confirmed by the New Testament quotations in particular. The Gospels and Epistles were mainly read by this progressive Church in the Vulgate version. Yet the influence of

[1] See Schöll, *De Ecclesiasticae Britonum Scotorumque Historiae Fontibus*, p. 17; Haddan and Stubbs, vol. i. pp. 175 n., 191, on the agreement or disagreement with MSS. A and B of the Septuagint; and also Appendix G, p. 195, Old Latin Extract.

the Old Latin, under which people had been brought up, makes itself felt constantly.

A further significant fact deserves mention if Gildas is taken in his use of Scripture as a type of his countrymen. He evidently regarded Solomon as a prophet and ascribed to him four books—Proverbs, Ecclesiastes (Song of Songs is not quoted), the Book of Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus. He would never have thus spoken of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus as works of Solomon, had he read or had he accepted the position taken in Jerome's *Praefatio ad Libros Salomonis*, as we know he had read and employed the same Father's Preface to Jeremiah.

These books were to him and, we may infer, to the Church in Britain portions of Holy Scripture, so that neither he nor that Church agrees with any Church of the present day. The Book of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are, for Gildas, canonical, wherein he agrees with the Greek and Roman Churches, but differs from them by his inclusion of 4 Esdras also. He differs from Protestant Churches through his inclusion of all three, and probably the older version of them continued to be used in the services of the Church.

This account of the Bible in the British Church, where both old versions and the New Version were in use, serves, I believe, to suggest that there was an extensive use of Holy Scripture among the Britons. But further, as evidence of the use also of Christian literature, several of the writings of Jerome, as intimated already, were known in Britain, as, for instance, the Prologues to the books translated, the *Epistolae* of Jerome and Commentaries, the *De Viris Illustribus*, the *Dialogi contra Pelagianos*; these are quoted in the *De Excidio*. Moreover, the *Historia Ecclesiastica* of Eusebius, in the Latin version of Rufinus, as well as the two books added by Rufinus himself (xi, xii), Theodoret's *Historia*, possibly also the *Orationes* of Gregory Nazianzen in Latin, are used by Gildas in the *Address to Princes and Priests*, a fact that implies at least a moderate acquaintance with this literature of 'the great Church'. The familiarity with which he introduced allegory in exegetical allusions for the interpretation of Scripture,

finding hidden meanings in unexpected pieces of pure narrative by the use, as he expresses it, of 'symbolical meaning' (*tropicus sensus*), of 'moral signification' (*moralis intelligentia*), and of 'moral interpretation' (*moraliter interpretari*), implies in him and his readers a knowledge of the writings that in the fourth and fifth centuries had transferred this product of Greek theology into Latin. He speaks also of 'precepts of saints' (*praecepta sanctorum*) as opposed to 'the unseemly tales of men of the world', by which he reminds us of such a work as John Cassian's *Instituta,* and other similar writings. It would be well within the bounds of probability to suppose that a wider range of literature was known and resorted to in Britain than that of which traces are found in the contents of a single work.

In this Church of the British people, the ministry which had for centuries become normal in all parts, consisting of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, was the only one. Once more, to gain a better perspective and greater detail, the *De Excidio* should be consulted. The writer, looking at men and things with the eye of an extreme reforming ascetic, has, undoubtedly, introduced profuse exaggeration into his *Address* or *Epistle* to the Priests of Britain. But his moral code is high and exacting; he is terribly, fearlessly in earnest. After the heritage of corruption transmitted from the Empire, there existed among the bishops, we may well believe him, a laxity that led to scandalous living; there were also men prompted by selfish ambition, 'more ready to seek ecclesiastical offices than the kingdom of heaven, positions which they defend without adorning' (c. 66). All the bishops and presbyters were not so evil as those described, he admits; many, he allows, were 'chaste and good', but to them he says briefly, 'What did it avail Eli that he himself did not violate the Lord's precepts? Who of them has suffered death as Abel? Who of them has refused to admit into the Church an enemy of God? Who, like Joseph, has rooted out of his heart the memory of an injury? Who, to use a figure, like Moses, has spoken with the Lord on the mountain, and descended without fear, holding the two tables, among the people

with a face impossible to look upon? Which of you, who loll listlessly rather than sit, as ye ought, in the priestly chair, was cast out from the council of the wicked, and, like the holy apostles, gave thanks that he was held worthy to suffer contumely for Christ the true God?' This monk, cast in a sterner mould, has no marked respect for bishops and presbyters who are just simply good.

Of a certainty, such a bishop as Sidonius Apollinaris, in Auvergne, 'selected by the people who knew quite well the kind of man they wanted,' as Dr. Bigg says, would have been to him almost an object of scorn. Dr. Hodgkin and Dr. Bigg have a kindly feeling towards him; scholar, country gentleman, and courtier as he had been, 'after his consecration there was no violent change. What he had given to the state he gave henceforth to the Church, but his ideal remained the same as ever, that of simple, manly, reasonable service.'[1] Yet I am afraid the austere Gildas would have placed Sidonius in his second class, and perhaps low in it. Yet the fierce words of the *De Excidio* are decidedly moderate compared with the invectives of St. Dunstan and his fellow reformers in the tenth century; still more moderate do they appear in comparison with the language used by the fiery zeal of Peter Damiani and Gregory VII in their efforts for purity. The reformer is, generally, possessed by graver views than the many, whence his strong and, at times, 'intemperate' language, whence also his success.

There was, however, we are glad to know, besides the dissolute, and the good that were too indolent or too easy, a third class. While fierce against the first, and treating the second in an almost disdainful tone, Gildas found in the third class the men whom he loved. Those had obtained the 'apostolic chair' in a regular way. It was in the regularly appointed pastor (*legitimus pastor*) that the man skilled to dispense spiritual food (*spiritualia cibaria*) for his Lord's household was found. There are striking words that tell of failure on the part of some who sought the

[1] Bigg, *Wayside Sketches of Ecclesiastical History*, p. 81.

much-coveted episcopal office to secure ordination in their own community (*parochia*), and sent embassies and sailed across the seas to secure the prize of ordination, returning to set 'violent hands on the holy sacrifices of Christ'.

Every bishop was, apparently, the pastor of a *parochia* in its older sense, that is, of a single community.[1] There were no presbyters except those serving with a bishop in his own church. Deacons (*diaconi*) are also called *ministri by Gildas as by other writers*, for whom as for the other orders there was a special service at ordination as clerics (c. 109). There was a deacon from Britain at the Council of Arles (314).

The monk's message, being part, probably, of a general propaganda issuing originally from the monastery of Illtud, began to take effect. The revival would number among its workers 'the brethren' who urged Gildas to issue his work, who also shared his grief of heart at what they beheld. Among them we may probably count Samson, Teilo, and Dewi. But many others were of their mind. The news before long reached Ireland, for Finian, Brendan, Kieran, Comgall, founders of famed Irish monasteries, came over to learn the new life from 'the three holy men, Dewi, Cathmael and Gildas'.

A fresh period had begun in Britain; the 'rigour and vigour' spread and inspired new men among the bishops, among the other orders, among the people. And the new life spreads to Ireland.

Here we may pause a moment to observe that we have hardly any trace of the so-called 'monastic episcopacy'. Many bishops were, like St. David, monks *and* bishops; others, such as Gildas, though monks and abbots, were simply presbyters. Of any authority possessed by the

[1] The two terms *parochia* and *dioecesis*, it has been observed, have had almost the same history. Both were originally Greek words (παροικία, διοίκησις). They mean (1) a single church presided over by a bishop; (2) then one denotes a group of churches under a bishop, while the other points to a single church (Sulp. Severus, Ep. 1); (3) both denote a single church under a presbyter subject to a bishop.

abbot of a monastery as such, we find no evidence except at Hi (Iona); even there Beda's statement that it was 'contrary to the usual method' must be taken to apply no less to the Celtic than the English sees. Finan, the second of the Irish missionaries who evangelized North and Mid-England, was a monk, and consecrated several bishops—Diuma for the Mid-Angles, and after him Ceollach, Cedd among the East Saxons, and Trumhere in Mercia—but left them entirely free to govern their sees in the usual English (Roman) manner. No monks or abbots are addressed by Gildas; he makes no appeal to them as invested with any authority whatever. This theory of a 'monastic episcopate' which so many German historians have adopted, followed also by some English writers, has, I am convinced, no basis in fact so far as Britain is concerned. Columba's institutions, over which he exercised authority, were monasteries, and the authority would be mainly monastic, though in individual cases the rule might be loose.

Monachism, we infer, did not have so great an effect as to exclude the old methods of Church administration. The order of bishops, such as we have seen in our references to Gildas's work, lived on, and they naturally took a leading position in the conference with Augustine about sixty years afterwards. The offices and functions of bishop, presbyter, deacon continued to exist, profoundly affected, however, by the discipline of the monachism which reigned everywhere. The words used by Sidonius Apollinaris of Riocatus, *antistes ac monachus*, might be used of the bishop in numerous churches.

As an order the bishops, we say, continued to exist, participating to the full in the changes resultant on the revival of monachism, yet remaining as heretofore administrators of Church life and worship. Gildas gives no hint of any distinction of grade or authority among them, though, had such existed, an appeal to it might have greatly aided his object. The appeal he makes is to *all* bishops indiscriminately, every one of whom holds the 'apostolic throne' (*apostolica sedes*), because every bishop

is a 'successor of Peter', all bishops in this early sense of the term being 'successors of the Apostles'. Their position in this respect reminds us of that adopted in the Letters of Cyprian. In other words, a primitive conception lived on in Britain, certainly until the middle of the sixth century, though not without admixture with later ideas. An active Church is always borrowing; this one did from Jerome and others, hence the preservation of old customs did not in Britain prevent a moderate appropriation of newer ways of thinking. The peculiar features of its Church life were nearly all similar survivals.

In the *De Excidio* a fragment of a British Ordinal has been preserved, and Gildas reminds bishops, presbyters, and deacons of the day of their ordination.[1] I refer to cc. 106–7.

The former of these chapters speaks of 'those Lessons which have been extracted from almost every befitting text of the Holy Scriptures not only to be recited for this object, but also for confirmation of that rite by which the hands of priests or ministers undergo initiation'.[2] This form of 'initiation of hands' for the three orders appears in Martene's *Ordines*, ii and iii, and in the Gelasian Sacramentary. It seems to have been general, not Roman. At the unction of the hands of presbyters and deacons there was a prayer:—

> May those hands be initiated and sanctified by that unction and our blessing so that whatsoever things they bless may be blessed, and whatsoever things they sanctify may be sanctified.

[1] With the references in Gildas I have compared the *Missale Francorum*, a compilation of Gallic rites drawn up, Morinus says, about the middle of the sixth century. The *Missale*, it is generally agreed, contains materials older than the time of its compilation. Cf. especially vol. ii, pp. 661 ff. of Muratori's *Liturgia Romana Vetus*. Also the *Ordines* of Martene in his *De Antiquis Ecclesiae Ritibus*, esp. liber i, c. viii, pp. 351 ff., edition of 1700. Again, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*, edited by Wilson (1894), pp. 144–9.

[2] 'Ad Lectiones illas quae ad hoc non solum recitentur, sed etiam adstipulentur benedictioni qua initiantur sacerdotum vel ministrorum manus.'

In the consecration of bishops the prayer began :—

May those hands be anointed with holy oil and the chrism of sanctification, &c., &c.

Gildas naturally omits all reference to the prayers, though prayers of prescribed forms were used by custom (*consuetudo*); the weight of his appeal rested on the *adstipulari*, that is, the full confirmation and adstipulation of Scripture.

The Lessons (*lectiones*) for that day were selected, he avers, for this special purpose. We may infer that there were two, which would have been arranged as follows :—

The First Lesson consisted of 1 Peter i, ii and Acts i. 15–26.

The Second Lesson was 1 Timothy iii, 1 Peter i. 13–23, St. Matthew xvi. 13–19.

He mentions a Second Lesson definitely. First he says: 'These things were commanded by the Apostle, and were read on the day of your ordination (haec quidem ab apostolo mandata, et in die vestrae ordinationis lecta);' then, after quoting from 1 Peter, he writes: 'in lectione Actus Apostolarum lectum est (It is said in the lesson from the Acts of the Apostles).' After this come the words: 'You have certainly heard the sound of the Second Lesson from the Apostle Paul (auscultastis quidem *secundae lectionis* apostoli Pauli verborum sonum),' with a quotation from 1 Timothy i and iii; also what is contained in the Second Lesson from St. Peter: 'quid in eiusdem (Petri) secunda lectione contineatur,' so that portions of 1 Peter were read twice.

Besides the initiation of hands, reading of Scripture, and prayers, a fourth rite of that day is implied in further words used by Gildas: 'After the fashion of idols which see not, neither do they hear, you stood the same day at the altar (*eodem die altari astitistis*), while then and always he (St. Paul) was thundering at you.' Those about to be ordained stood, thus, at the altar, so that we may infer that ordination in Britain, as in Gaul, was followed by the celebration of masses (*missae*) at that altar. Bishops were consecrated and probably presbyters were ordained to be priests, and priests in the Old Testament

sense of the word. The idea that they were priests as representatives of the priesthood of believers finds no countenance in Gildas. 'On that day,' he says, 'ye were promoted to the priesthood (*ad sacerdotium traheremini*)'; the function of each, in the words of the *Missale Francorum*, of the same age, was: *Ut corpus et sanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformet.* We will quote one more sentence: 'Let us see what threats the Lord utters by the prophets against slothful and unseemly priests. and such as do not teach the people well by example and words' (c. 76). The first illustration is 'Eli, that priest in Shiloh'. The idea, of vast importance in the history of the Church, that the Christian bishop is a priest of God, found certainly, though sparingly, in Tertullian (about 200), but clearly expressed in Cyprian (died in 258), who is unquestionably followed by the great writers of the fourth century—Jerome, Augustine, and, above all, Ambrose of Milan—is seen to be the accepted and common view in Britain also. The fourth-century authors advanced upon Cyprian by including the presbyters in this priesthood, in which usage they were followed by Gallic writers of the fifth century. By the sixth, bishop and presbyter had long been regarded as men upon whom the exclusive functions of priesthood were conferred in their consecration and ordination.[1]

Being priests, the bishops of Britain were regarded as possessing 'the power of binding and loosing'. Gildas, addressing Cuneglasus, says to him: 'Change thy life and cause them to pray for thee, to whom is given the power (*potestas*) to bind above the world whom they have bound guilty (*reos*) in the world, and to loose whom they have absolved as penitent.'[2] Again: 'To every holy priest it

[1] In Christian terminology *priest* is ambiguous, because while it is derived from *presbyter* it is also employed for *sacerdos*. The latter is the only meaning given it in these passages. On the application of *sacerdos* first to bishops and later to both bishop and presbyter, see *Studia Biblica et Theologica*, vol. iv, p. 257.

[2] 'Fac eos potius, mutatis moribus, quibus suppetit supra mundum alligandi cum in mundo reos alligaverint, et solvendi cum poenitentes solverint, potestas' (c. 32, also c. 109). This would now be termed the 'power of giving absolution' and the 'power of withholding absolution'

is also promised: And whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven.'[1] Roman and Briton agreed here.

Yet for Gildas, there can be no doubt, the pre-eminent, almost the only function of the Christian priesthood is to be a ministry of teaching and guidance. But it should also be noted that in Britain at that time the priest ceased to be priest, if Gildas represents the common view, when his life and work were not worthy. 'O ye enemies and not priests of God, veterans in wickedness and not bishops, traitors, not successors of the holy apostles and not ministers of Christ!' (c. 108). So Gildas speaks, and again: 'It is plain that the man who from his heart calls you priest is not a good Christian' (c. 109).

Differences in matters of ceremonial might not affect the relation of the British to the Roman Church, as there was no uniformity anywhere in the sixth century.[2] It would not affect the great Pope who sent Augustine, but he on his way to Britain had been perturbed at the different customs he had observed during his long journey through Gaul—*ecclesiarum diversae consuetudines*—hence this question: 'Since there is one faith how can there be different usages in the Churches? How is one use of masses observed in the Holy Roman Church and another in Gaul?' (Beda, *H. E.* i. 27). His ideal was to secure in Britain identity of usages where there was identity of faith.

The *Eucharist* has already been described as sacrificial worship: 'They seldom sacrifice and never stand amid the altars with pure heart' (c. 66, 'raro sacrificantes, et nunquam puro corde inter altaria stantes'). There are no British Liturgical books to supply us with information, but some idea of its ornate and perhaps lengthy character may be obtained from a study of the Gallic *Mass of St. Germain*, the Irish *Stowe Missal*, and the *Antiphonary of Bangor*.[3]

[1] Gildas, c. 109, quoting St. Matt. xvi. 19.

[2] See Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, pp. 114 ff., 143 ff., 180 ff.

[3] The first is printed by Duchesne, pp. 180–217. The second in Warren, *The Liturgy of the Celtic Church*, pp. 198–248. The third in

It is outside the scope of our present purpose to do more than refer to the works mentioned.

These liturgies are in Latin. The same would be the case with the purely British. As far as the public reading of Scripture went, and the whole ritual in this highest ordinance of the Church, the people heard all in the Latin tongue. The preaching, with the explanation of Scripture that formed part of it, was the only portion conducted in the vernacular. Of this tremendous loss, however, such a writer as Gildas does not seem to be conscious, neither do the writers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries betray any concern at so momentous a need. Beda felt it and made suitable translations into English. The number of those who were conversant with Latin, besides ecclesiastics and monks, may indeed have been many, yet the large mass of the people would certainly have been ignorant of it, and by this ignorance would have been led to attach superstitious ideas to the eucharistic rite, without understanding the grand solemnity of its language.

Warren's book, pp. 187-94, but also in a splendid facsimile edition by the same editor, and published by the Henry Bradshaw Society in two volumes, 1892, 1894.

CHAPTER XXVI

TWO CHURCHES (*continued*)

II

Our further task is to describe other features in the life of the British Church before and after 603 (the year of the conference between Augustine and the Britons), as contrasted with the Anglo-Roman Church. For this purpose it is necessary to take a somewhat extensive view of each characteristic.

(*a*) Of all differences the most important for the time was that which concerned the day on which Easter was to be celebrated. Here arose the greatest irritation, and there was bitterness and alienation, so that cogent reasons exist for beginning with this difference. Beda gives an illustration of the practical difficulties to which differing systems gave rise. 'Whilst the king (Oswy),' who followed the Celtic system, 'having ended his fast was keeping Easter, the queen and her followers were still fasting.' Easter was sometimes twice celebrated in one household in the same year.[1]

Once more it will be necessary, in order to view this controversy in its true perspective, the Irish and British custom being a survival, to describe briefly the systems of calculation which prevailed in different Churches, and at different periods of time in the same Church. In these pages we may, with advantage and no loss, limit ourselves to the history of the Easter question as it affected Western Churches only. It may be premised that Easter Day, as continuing the Jewish Pascha, was regulated by the moon of spring-tide. The Lunar year, however, is eleven days and a little more shorter than the Solar, so that January 1 of any year begins with a moon that is eleven days older

[1] Beda, *H. E.* iii. 35.

than it was on January 1 of the preceding year. Again, Easter, so custom demanded, must be held on a Sunday. Now an ordinary year of 365 days has fifty-two weeks and one day, and if all years were so, Sunday would fall on the same day of the month every seventh year, but every fourth year is leap year, having fifty-two weeks and two days, so that the required incidence, as far as the sun is concerned, comes every $4 \times 7 = 28$ years. This is called the Solar Cycle. Since the Moon-year and the Sun-year have to be combined, some method must be determined upon for finding a common number when the two periods of years will begin anew with the same day. Two systems only need be mentioned here. One is called *the 84-year cycle*, resting upon three solar cycles ($3 \times 28 = 84$). In eighty-four solar years there are 30,681 days, and in the same period 1,039 moons of 30,682 days, 6 hours 48 minutes. Between these two there is consequently a difference of about one and a quarter days, which is manipulated by minute calculations of Epacts and months, which we pass by without further comment here, for the sake of simplicity. The other mode of reckoning was that which, through its early use at Athens when Meton was Archon, bore the name of the Metonic cycle of nineteen years (*decemnovalis cyclus*). In every period of nineteen solar years there are $6{,}939\frac{3}{4}$ days, and the lunar years of that same time have $6{,}940\frac{3}{4}$ days. This difference of one day is mathematically disposed of as in the former method.

The equinox was not in all places reckoned as falling on the same day; then another difficulty arose as to whether, when the full moon (*Luna XIV*) fell on a Sunday, at or after the equinox, that Sunday could be regarded as Easter Sunday. These differences will appear, as our outline of the controversy advances, until we reach Britain in 603 and see how the sundered Churches stood.

What reference must be made to ancient writers will appear as we proceed, but a short list of books on this subject, which might be counted almost by legions, may be of service. I only give the names of modern books and of those I am myself acquainted with. One would give to the *Excursus* on Easter in Mr. Plummer's edition of Beda a foremost place.

Among German books the classic work of Ideler still holds its place: *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*, in two vols., 1825, 1826. Franz Ruhl, *Chronologie des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit*, 1897. The most thorough investigations are certainly in the writings of Bruno Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie. Der 84 jährige Ostercyclus und seine Quellen.* Mommsen is invaluable with Krusch in his *Chronica Minora*, vol. i; or vol. ix of *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*. Joseph Schmid: *Die Osterfestberechnung auf den britischen Inseln vom Anfang des 4. bis zum Ende des 8. Jahrhunderts* (1904), and by the same: *Die Osterfestberechnung in der Abendländischen Kirche* (1907).

I believe that the following will prove serviceable in making the subject clearer:—

(1) *Laterculus* of Augustalis prepared for A.D. 213 to 312.

(2) *Romana Supputatio* for A.D. 312–42. Printed in Mommsen's *Chronica Minora*, i, p. 62, as included in 'the Chronographer of 354'.

(3) The later *Supputatio* from 342. Then came the break-down in 444.

(4) The Paschal Table of Zeitz, published in 447, followed by its break-down in 455.

(5) The *Cursus Paschalis* of Victorius, prepared in 457; printed by Mommsen in *Chronica Minora*, i, p. 666.

(6) Table of Dionysius Exiguus, based on Alexandrian lines, published A.D. 525, and quickly adopted at Rome—the method used by Augustine in 603 for fixing the 'Catholic Easter'.

(1)-(4) are based on the 84-year cycle; (5) on a combination of the twenty-eight years of the 'Solar cycle' and the nineteen of the other system, i.e. on a basis of $28 \times 19 = 532$, i.e. 532 years; (6) is, in substance, the Alexandrian mode of reckoning.

Beda makes two important statements in the same chapter respecting the Celtic computation: first, they followed 'doubtful cycles'; secondly, they were not Quartodecimans, holding their Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon whatever day of the week it might be.[1] They held it on the Sunday, but when the full moon, or Luna XIV, fell on a Sunday, *that* Sunday was for them Easter Day. Not so with the Romans, nor with the Alexandrians, both of whom in that case postponed their Easter until the following Sunday. Another important difference emerges just here, but this may be kept out of view until the more fundamental lines in the course of the separation between

[1] Beda, *H. E.* iii. 4 'in tempore quidem summae festivitatis dubios circulos sequentes'; ibid. in the next paragraph: 'quem tamen et antea non semper in luna xiiii cum Iudaeis, ut quidam rebantur, sed in die quidem dominica, alia tamen quam decebat, ebdomada celebrabant.'

Rome and Britain have been traced. There is no need of going further back than the period extending from A.D. 213 to 313.

(1) During these years the Church of Rome used a mode of reckoning which goes under the name of Augustalis. It began with the year of the Passion (which was placed on March 25, A.D. 28) and was based on the 84-year cycle. Official recognition was given some time after A.D. 268 to this mode of calculation, which ruled the usage of the Roman Church until 312.

(2) A modified form of the *Laterculus* of Augustalis may be discerned in the *Romana Supputatio*. This again rested upon the 84-year cycle and held its place in the official Roman Calendar from 312 to 342. The earliest possible Easter Sunday was March 25, the latest April 21.

It was this reckoning that the British bishops present at the Council of Arles in 314 *carried home with them.*[1] For their Church, which hitherto had, probably, no fixed rule, it had all the influence of that first Council of the West and of the Church of Rome itself. It seems to have been adopted generally in Britain and afterwards in Ireland. St. Patrick would have been acquainted with no other in his native British home, and it may have reached Ireland before his missionary work began there.[2]

(3) In 343 Rome saw a later *Supputatio*, again based on the 84-year cycle, in which Easter would range between March 22 and April 21. *Here a difference of usage as compared with the British mode is discernible*, because March 22 is fixed in order to avoid holding Easter on the day of the full moon itself. This arrangement, however, broke down in 444, when Leo I was at first unwilling to fall in with the Bishop of Alexandria's reckoning against the Roman. By the Roman method Easter was to be celebrated on March 26, but by the Alexandrian on April 23.

[1] This suggestion was first made by the Roman archaeologist De Rossi, *Inscriptiones urbis Romanae Christianae*, I, p. lxxxvi.

[2] This *Romana Supputatio* is embedded in the work of 'the Chronographer of 354', as he is called. See *Chronica Minora*, i, p. 62, in vol. ix of *Monum. Germaniae Historica*.

The correspondence between the two bishops has not been preserved, but a letter from Pascasinus, Bishop of Lilybaeum in Sicily, whom Leo had consulted on the question, gave a new turn to these Roman reckonings. Pascasinus at Lilybaeum lived in the midst of a learned circle, and his letter states plainly his agreement with Alexandria. When in 417 a similar difference had arisen and the Bishop of Rome refused to agree with his better instructed brother of Alexandria, the very baptisteries themselves, he says, by their own miraculous filling, at the right time, for Easter baptisms condemned the error.[1] The year 444 found not only Leo conforming with Alexandria, *but also preparing for a better mode of calculation.* Reference has been made to this year in the chapter on the *Annales Cambriae* (Ch. XXIII), because we find in the change, and in the determination at Rome and throughout the West to adopt a better computation, *a reason for the selection of* 444 *as the initial year of the Annales.*

(4) A new attempt in this direction was, after long deliberation, drawn up by 447. This table is called the Zeitz Table, from the place in which it is kept, since Bishop Julius Pflugk (who died in 1564) bequeathed his books and MSS. to its Gymnasium. It is printed by Mommsen as the *Liber paschalis codicis Cizensis a CCCCXLVII.*[2] This Easter Table is again based on the 84-year cycle. Its lunar term is from Luna XVI to Luna XXII, and the period in which Easter may fall is from March 22 to April 24, so that the computist is here following the Alexandrians. This calculation broke down in 455, when Leo anew yielded to Alexandria. The change then made, from April 17 to April 24, is recorded in the first entry of the *Annales Cambriae* as a *change* of Easter (*pasca commutatur*) made 'by the Britons in conformity with Leo, Bishop of Rome'. Leo's letter to 'the bishops of the Gauls', announcing the change in 454, must have come to Britain as a part of the Prefecture of Galliae, and

[1] The letter may be read in Migne, vol. i, coll. 606-10, *Paschasini episcopi Lilybetani ad Leonem Papam: De Paschate Anni* 444.

[2] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, vol. ix, pp. 501-8.

proves that at that time there were communications between the Bishop of Rome and Britain, though there were details in the Zeitz Table reckoning with which the Britons could not concur.

(5) Canons of Victorius. This table was drawn up in 457 by Victorius of Aquitaine, at the request of Hilarius, then Archdeacon of the Church at Rome, for the use of Leo the Great. It is based upon a cycle of 532 years suggested by the combination of a Solar cycle of twenty-eight years and the nineteen years of the Alexandrians, $28 \times 19 = 532$. It is alluded to and partly described by Gennadius in his *De Viris Illustribus*, c. 88.[1] (There is a slight error here, but Hilary succeeded Leo and may have authoritatively proclaimed the *Cursus*.) The table is printed in full with introduction by Mommsen.[2] In it *the Church of Rome abandoned the* 84*-year cycle*, but with singular tenacity the Britons still clung to it. Rome undoubtedly had a more perfect one, but the Britons persisted in their use of the less perfect. Yet the *Cursus* of Victorius was known among the Britons, for Nennius uses and quotes from it.[3]

(6) Table of Dionysius Exiguus, published in A. D. 525. In this table, the authoritative adoption of which was not long delayed, Rome and Alexandria were in agreement; both had the 19-year cycle with the other accessory details. It was this computation of Dionysius that brought in the use of *Anni Domini nostri Iesu Christi*; substituting the Christian Era for the Era of Diocletian.[4]

Returning to Britain, and to the conference of 603, we see that it was this computation of Dionysius, in reality not quite eighty years old, and called 'Roman', 'Petrine', 'Catholic', that Augustine imposed as a crucial test upon bishops and 'learned men' of the ancient Church of

[1] 'Natione Aquitanicus, calculator scripulorum, invitatus a sancto Hilario urbis Romae episcopo composuit paschalem cursum,' &c., &c.

[2] *Mon. Germ. Hist.*, vol. ix, pp. 669–735.

[3] See Nennius in Mommsen's edition, p. 209.

[4] The table with its Praefatio is printed in Migne, tome 67, coll. 493 ff. *Noluimus*, he says in introducing the *Anni Domini*, 'circulis nostris memoriam impii et persecutoris innectere.'

Britain. It was the first act of his archiepiscopate, rash and tactless.

We find throughout the whole controversy how certain ideas ruled the minds of men, and how beliefs, which by their very crudity appear to us almost unthinkable, held sway over both sides. It is in these beliefs growing out of historical fictions that the fundamental causes of the prolongation of the controversy are to be sought. Perhaps the fiction most widely accepted was the belief that the Council of Nicaea had discussed and settled upon a course by which all Churches throughout the world should hold Easter on the same day. All that was done may be seen in the emperor's letter to the bishops that were not present at the Council; none of the canons, it should be marked, refer to the subject. The Paschal feast, he says, having been discussed, it was unanimously decided that it should everywhere be celebrated on the same day. This was really all, and in a few years Rome and Alexandria were in disagreement respecting that 'same day'.

The holding of Easter on the 21st or 22nd day of the moon was especially objectionable to the Celtic Churches of Britain and Ireland. It appeared to them incongruous that the day which commemorates the Lord's Resurrection, His victorious rising as the Sun of Righteousness out of the darkness of death, should be celebrated on a day when light, as they held, was becoming shorter than darkness.[1]

They also believed that they had Apostolic authority for celebrating Easter on the fourteenth day of the Moon, in the person of St. John, who instituted Easter in the cities of Asia Minor. The same usage, they maintained, had been handed down by the honoured Anatolius. It was by such beliefs as these that the Britons had become so tenacious of their customs. The question of a better or worse calculation was lost sight of; the Britons had undoubtedly the worse,

[1] See the letter of Columbanus written between 595 and 600, *Mon. Germ. Hist., Epp.* vol. iii, pp. 157–8 'Luna enim vigesima prima aut secunda extra ius lucis est, utpote post medium noctis tunc temporis exorta, et tenebris lucem superantibus, lucis solemnitas nefas est, ut aiunt, agi.'

the Romans the better. On the other hand, the Romans or Anglo-Romans were in no wise superior to the Britons in the choice of grounds on which they founded their argument. They also resorted to traditions, and traditions which were merely fictions.

The positions held by either side may be understood from the assertions made by Colman and Wilfrid at the Synod of Whitby. At that synod the Celtic party, led by Colman, averred that their Easter was 'the same which the blessed John the Evangelist, the disciple specially beloved of our Lord, with all the Churches over which he presided, is recorded to have established'. There is a grain of truth hidden here.[1] Of a similar character was the belief, also enunciated by Colman, that they were following 'the holy Anatolius' in 'celebrating Easter from the fourteenth to the twentieth moon'. This canon of Anatolius has now been proved to be a forgery of British origin.[2]

On the other hand, by Wilfrid, speaking on behalf of the Roman custom, it was held that 'when Peter preached at Rome . . . he perceived that Easter ought to be kept after this manner; he always awaited the rising of the moon at the fourteenth day of the first month in the evening, &c.', describing the accepted Roman Easter. 'Peter celebrated Easter Sunday,' he proceeds, 'between the fifteenth and the twenty-first moon.' Again: 'But as for you and your companions, *you certainly sin* if, having heard the decrees of the Apostolic See, nay, of the universal Church, confirmed, as they are, by Holy Scripture (!), you scorn to follow them.'[3] This was fictitious tradition transformed into history. Nevertheless it was these other ideas, which no one would now listen to for a moment, that won the approbation of King Oswy and his people. If St. Peter fixed the Roman usage, we must, they argued, follow him. About the time

[1] Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24.

[2] See Krusch, *Quellen*, p. 62. *Liber Anatholi de ratione paschali;—a Pseudo Anatolius.* 'Es sind die Osterregeln der älteren supputatio Romana, welche später nur noch in Britannien angewendet wurde. . . . An der britannischen Herkunft des Pseudo-Anatolius ist mithin nicht zu zweifeln.' See p. 70. Cf. Euseb. *H. E.* vii. 32 on *Anatolius.*

[3] Beda, *H. E.* iii. 25. See also Ceolfrid's letter, ibid. v. 21.

when Augustine was holding his conference with the British, the Irish missionary Columbanus was pleading by letter, by several letters in fact, with the bishops of Burgundy, for forbearance and goodwill. 'May it be allowed me, with peace and charity on your part, to be quiet in these woods and live near the bones of my seventeen departed brethren. . . . Let Gaul, I pray, hold us together in company, as the kingdom of heaven will hold us.' Yet he declares in the midst of this pathetic letter: 'I confess the secret convictions of my conscience, I have greater faith in the tradition of my own country respecting the teaching and computation of the eighty-four years and respecting Anatolius . . . than in Victorius who has lately written in a dubious way.'[1] Here, again, as in Britain, we have patriotic clinging to tradition, and faith in Anatolius bars the way to reconciliation. The English were in the same bondage. It may be noted in passing that there was no agreement in Gaul. Gregory of Tours, who died in 594, mentions two great crises in his own time. It was to accept Victorius of Aquitaine, not the Roman Dionysius Exiguus, that Columbanus was pressed. The former system —that of Victorius—held its place in that country long beyond the time when it was sought to impose the Roman Easter in Britain.

Beda refers to a 'notable book' written by Aldhelm, who had been Abbot of Malmesbury, but was at the time of writing (705) Bishop of Sherborne. This was a letter to Geraint, King of Damnonia, written at the command of a very numerous West Saxon synod.[2]

Upon reading this letter anew I am much struck by the extreme, almost fierce language in which it insists that the British must conform with the 'Catholic' Easter. The old false charge of unfaithfulness to the 318 bishops (of Nicaea)

[1] *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Ep.* 2 *Columbae sive Columbani* A.D. 603–4, vol. iii *Epistolarum*, p. 160. His letter to Pope Gregory precedes this one, and shows the same strong convictions, with similar references to *Victorius* and *Anatolius*.

[2] 'Nuper cum essem in concilio episcoporum—ubi ex tota pene Brittania innumerabilis Dei sacerdotum caterva confluxit.'

is advanced afresh; the disobedience of Britain is 'an extremely cruel ruin of souls'.

The rules inculcated by him are 'the fundamental enactments of St. Peter's Church, because St. Peter has the keys': to cultivate reverence for the two Testaments, to believe in the Holy Trinity is of faith for all, but, he proceeds, it is vain to profess the Catholic faith unless a man follows the decree and rule of St. Peter.[1] I leave these false presuppositions and their implication of the rightfulness of the Roman ascendancy to be their own interpreters.

It was events such as have been described which grieved the pious soul of Beda; as he reviewed the past he saw that what might have been a question simply of computation had called into hostile existence pious, though mistaken, beliefs, which had become test points of Catholicity. In Beda's opinion the Britons were 'heretics, because they had despised the offer of eternal salvation' (ii. 2); 'they despised the faith and religion of the English (ii. 20). On the other hand, 'the Roman is the Catholic and Apostolic Church' (iii. 29); in it and by the adoption of its Easter, there comes a 'consecration to Christ, as it were by a new ray of the grace and fellowship that is in the Church' (v. 22). 'The Britons, though they for the most part assail the English nation in their native hatred, and wrongfully and wickedly attack the fixed Easter of the whole Catholic Church, yet since both divine and human power withstand them, they can in neither purpose attain their object.' Yet one cannot for a moment entertain the idea that Beda, Aldhelm, and others were more devout than many a bishop of the British Church.

I have dwelt at some length on this subject of Easter, because in the controversy to which it gave birth we may mark the essential principle of the Roman demands made by Augustine and those who succeeded him. The issue involved far more than a date.

[1] *Monumenta Moguntina*, edited by Ph. Jaffé, vol. iii, p. 24. The letter is also printed in the vol. of *Mon. Germ. Hist.* which gives the letter of Columbanus, vol. iii, p. 231; Haddan and Stubbs, iii, pp. 258 ff.; Aldhelmi Opp., ed. Giles, pp. 24 ff.

It was well that the Britons were in time won over to adopt the better Roman computation of that great feast which commemorates our Lord's Resurrection, but it may be questioned whether it was right or worthy of the Anglo-Roman Church, *on this point alone*, to ostracize them and their Church, declaring that they were entirely outside the Catholic unity of the Church.[1]

(*b*) In the case of baptism, information from native sources is exceedingly limited. Yet here was a feature of decided difference on the part of Rome, simply because the British practised an older usage. The earliest directions known as to the administration of baptism are found in the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*.[2] The rite of baptism consists, as directed in that book, simply of immersion; or, in cases of necessity, of affusion, or pouring of water thrice on the candidate's head in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. But in the third century, in Tertullian, for instance, who writes at great length on baptism, the rite has already assumed a more complicated form. There are clear proofs of the supplementing during that century of immersion or sprinkling, by anointing with oil, renunciation of the devil, recitation of the baptismal creed, and imposition of hands; the whole bore the one name of baptism, the whole was performed by the bishop of a church. Three acts in course of time became more strictly baptismal —immersion or sprinkling, unction, imposition of hands. The last was later reserved for the bishop, while the others could be entrusted to a presbyter, the first to any layman. According to the *Gelasian Sacramentary* baptism consisted, apparently, of five acts—(1) Benediction of font, (2) Immersion or sprinkling three times, (3) Unction by a presbyter on the head (*in cerebro*), other sacramentaries (?) directing

[1] The disinclination of the Britons to accept the Anglo-Roman Easter may be paralleled by the refusal of England to adopt the *New Style* of the Gregorian Calendar published in a Papal Bull in the year 1582. England held out against this needed reform until 1752, a period of 170 years.

[2] Discovered by Bryennius, then Metropolitan of Nicomedia, and published at Constantinople in 1883. See p. 27 of the first edition, or chapter vii in Gebhardt and Harnack's edition.

this unction to be on the breast (*in pectore*), (4) Imposition of hands, (5) Unction with chrism on the forehead (*in fronte de chrismate*).[1] The last two 'complete' the baptism, if we borrow Augustine's words. The Roman Church had, since the early years of the fifth century, decreed that presbyters were allowed to use chrism, but were not to impress the seal on the forehead with the same oil, an act reserved for the bishops alone.[2] The chrism of confirmation, in the Roman way, belonged solely to the bishop; it was not so in the East, where chrism followed immediately upon the use of water, and this act was and is performed by a presbyter. There were countries in the West where this custom prevailed, and Britain was probably among them. If so, in Britain and Ireland chrism or confirmation, along with immersion or sprinkling, was performed in accordance with the older usage, by presbyters, whereas the Roman Church regarded it as exclusively the function of the bishop. When, therefore, Augustine demanded that the Britons should 'complete' baptism in the same way as the Roman Church, he was asking them to give up this custom. It is known that in Spain, after baptism had been delegated to presbyters, the presbyters there administered also 'the unction of chrism', that is, confirmation was administered by presbyters; so it was in Sardinia.[3] Father Férotin asserts: 'It must, in fine, be said that confirmation was an episcopal function which the bishops of Spain had entirely delegated to the presbyters, though it was administered with chrism consecrated by the bishop of the diocese.'[4] In Sardinia Gregory the Great had forbidden the presbyters to perform the rite of confirmation, but afterwards, upon understanding that the prohibition was causing tumult and

[1] *Gelasian Sacramentary*, by Wilson (1894), p. 86.

[2] 'Presbyteris cum baptizant chrismate baptizatos ungere licet, non tandem frontem eodem oleo signare quod solis debetur episcopis cum tradunt Spiritum Paracletum,' Innocent I (died 426).

[3] *Liber Ordinum*, p. 34, by Dom Marius Férotin, Benedictin de Farnborough, 1904.

[4] Ibid. 'Une fonction épiscopale que les évêques dans l'Espagne entière déléguaient aux prêtres.'

disorder, withdrew it.[1] Thus in 594 Gregory allowed in Sardinia a custom which Augustine in 603 was insisting that the Britons should abandon.

The Irish Stowe Missal describes an anointing of the breast and shoulders with oil and chrism (*oleo et crismate*) before the candidate is baptized. After that follow benediction and anointing of the water, when the catechumen is thrice immersed (or sprinkled). Then he is anointed on the forehead—*in cerebrum in fronte*—with chrism and clothed by the deacon in white raiment. It is the presbyter that performs this last unction, the unction of confirmation, saying: 'I anoint thee with oil and with the chrism of salvation and sanctification (*ungo te de oleo et crismate salutis et sanctificationis*).' A Life of St. Brigid describes a vision of presbyters clothed in white, pouring oil upon the head of a girl, '*completing* the order of baptism in the usual way (ordinem baptismi *complentes* consueto more).' Here we have the very word used by Augustine, for which its equivalent *perficere* is not uncommon.[2] We also know how St. Bernard asserts that St. Malachi had introduced anew (*de novo instituit*) the sacrament of confirmation into the Irish Church, where, in his (i.e. in the Roman) view, it did not exist previously, because not performed by a bishop.[3] We may infer that the British Church also, with the final act of baptism performed by a presbyter, had no confirmation in the Roman sense, or as confirmation was understood and practised in the English Church under Roman guidance.

(*c*) The metropolitan system, I feel sure, never reached the Church of which we speak, neither was the later custom of the independent charge of a church by a presbyter subject to the neighbouring bishop a part of the British organization.

[1] *Epistolae Greg. M., Mon. Germ. Hist.* iv. 26 'Ubi episcopi desunt ut presbyteri et in frontibus baptizandos chrismate tangere debeant concedimus.' May, 594.

[2] Synod of Elvira (306), 'Si quis diaconus regens plebem sine episcopo vel presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem *perficere* debebit.'

[3] *Vita Mal.* c. iii; *Opera*, tom. i. 1473.

Each church had its own bishop, as we have mentioned above, assisted by presbyters and deacons. Among the bishops themselves there were not those aggregations of their churches which afterwards made them subject to that one of themselves who bore the title *metropolitanus*, and (later) archbishop. The fact that Gregory the Great made 'all the bishops of the Britons' subject to the new English metropolitan is strong proof by implication that there was among them as yet no semblance of this system. Probably their political subjection to so many British princes, together with the tribal system that ruled everywhere in social relations, was prejudicial to the subordination of bishops under a metropolitan for any extensive area. Wasserschleben, in his work on the Irish Canons, remarks upon the almost entire absence of any reference, in these Celtic rules, to 'decisions governing the ecclesiastical constitution and the system of officials for Church jurisdiction. The organization of the Church into dioceses and provinces, the relation of the bishops as leaders of the former to the archbishop as head of the province, is only seldom mentioned.'[1] These belong to the seventh century. But even in the twelfth century, St. Bernard, in his Life of Malachias, states that there were in Ireland almost as many bishops as there were churches ('ita ut singulae pene ecclesiae singulos haberent episcopos'—*De Vita Mal.* c. 10). Other authors write to almost the same effect.[2] We find no direct statement respecting Britain, but Gildas's whole language fully implies the fact of the absence of the archbishop.

(*d*) These British bishops and presbyters undoubtedly were allowed to marry and have wives in holy wedlock. But for the purpose of proving this to be a fact, a quite erroneous use has been made of the statements found in the writings of Giraldus Cambrensis — Gerald the Welshman. He describes, it is true, the Welsh clergy as married, he also describes their sons as guilty of inheriting the positions and benefices held by the fathers. But the same is narrated

[1] Wasserschleben, *Die irische Kanonensammlung*, xxxvi 'Auffallend ist es, dass die Sammlung . . .'

[2] See Ussher, *Sylloge*, and *Ep.*, St. Anselm's letter to King Muirchertach.

of other countries. The defamatory names he gives the wives were common everywhere; though lawfully wedded ('quasi maritati copula') the wives are styled *focariae* and *concubinae*, the priestly husbands are *fornicarii et concubinarii*.[1]

But what he asserts respecting the Wales of his time was also, as he avers, common among 'nearly all the parish priests of England', two bishops even being named by him as similarly guilty.[2] He himself was in favour of allowing a certain latitude for the sake of morality, as we learn from the *Gemma Ecclesiastica*, where he declares that the prohibition of marriage to priests 'formed no part of early Christianity'; 'nunc,' he says, 'aliud tempus, alii pro tempore mores'.[3] The policy of Peter Damiani and Gregory VII had been unsuccessful in quelling the resistance of the clergy, as is evident from the decrees of a long series of councils and the statements of contemporary writers. The time of Giraldus was a period of universal struggle, and his description of the Welsh clergy, in so far as it is supposed to bear upon the particular question of a married clergy and the succession of their sons in Britain, is of no import. The same would be found almost everywhere. Another and pertinent piece of evidence may be found in the sober description given of Rychmarch as the son of a bishop, and in the affectionate appreciation of the same father by Rychmarch's brother John.[4] To the British, marriage was evidently becoming and holy in a bishop. The *Book of Llandâv* speaks of a presbyter named Sandef who was succeeded by his son Daniel.[5]

Moreover, in the *De Excidio*, Gildas[6] speaks approvingly of the bishop who is 'husband of one wife', his detestation

[1] *De Iure et Statu Menevensis Ecclesiae*, Dist. i, vol. iii, pp. 128–9. On the whole subject see Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy*, vols. i and ii.

[2] *Speculum Ecclesiae*, vol. iv, p. 170, and *De Iure et Statu Men. Eccl.* vol. iii, p. 131.

[3] *Gemma Eccles.* Dist. ii, vol. ii, p. 187.

[4] *Brut y Tywysogion*, pp. 273–4. Cf. *Psalter of Rychmarch* in the Library of Trinity College, Dublin.

[5] 'Post illum Daniel filius suus,' p. 279.

[6] cc. 66, 108, 118.

being reserved for the immoral ones to whom St. Paul's condemnatory words could be fittingly applied as 'being husband of wives (*vir uxorum*)'. Hence we may confidently infer that this Church at the time when Augustine met its representatives had preserved from primitive times the ideal of a chaste husband, and that husband a bishop or presbyter.

(*e*) With the simple account of ordination given above as found in Gildas it is in vain to compare the legendary narratives of the Lives. One passage in the Life of Samson is frequently quoted, and, while it gives but little real information, it may hand down just a confused echo of some special character. 'Then the festival was at hand,' so the account goes, 'when it was necessary that bishops should come together in that monastery for the ordination of a bishop, as was wont . . . and when the bishops who had come for the ordination had arrived, bringing with them two to be ordained, and desiring to ordain a third according to the custom handed down from antiquity, but as yet ignorant who he should be, *as it is the custom there that three should be ordained by three bishops*; during the following night the angel of the Lord came to Bishop (*papam*) Dubricius and said: "Know ye that Saint Samson must be the third ordained by you."' He is accordingly ordained as the elect of God, the dove from heaven in due course alighting on his head.

No information is extant respecting the election of Dubricius, Teilo, and David, or of the pastors who preceded these in their several *parochiae*, nor of their consecration. The requirement that three bishops at least should be present at the election and ordination of a bishop is first found in the *Apostolic Church Order*,[1] a document of the third century, when a church of even twelve members is in need of a bishop. As far as the wording of the text goes the three might be laymen, but the custom of inviting bishops for the election and ordination of a bishop seems to have

[1] *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. ii; also in Schaff's edition of the *Didaché*.

become universal after the Council of Nicaea. But the *Apostolic Church Order* describes the rule observed some time about 250[1] in Eastern parts, and even the Canons of Nicaea, three-quarters of a century later, may have taken long to reach Britain. If we pronounce ordination by one bishop to be a British custom, it may well be explained as a survival from that previous period—the first century and a quarter of the existence of Christian communities among the Britons.

(*f*) It is evident to readers of Beda that the British and English Churches differed also in the form of monastic and clerical tonsure. 'It behoves those who, having taken the vows of a monk, or the grade of a cleric . . .'; 'it must be in harmony with the use of the Church and with the Christian Faith' (v. 21). This, with the head shaved on the top in the form of a crown, was the tonsure which St. Peter took after his confession, and is called the 'tonsure of Peter'. On the other hand, the British, frontal only from ear to ear, was 'the tonsure of Simon Magus', which no Christian could use with propriety (ibid.). It was exactly these *unreal reasons*, naturally so ridiculous to the Christian of to-day, which were set forth by Beda in all gravity from the letter of the Abbot Ceolfrid, that contributed very largely to the unhappy controversy. They were easily understood by all. But taking an example or two from history we observe how utterly baseless was the English (Roman) contention, when stripped of all this growth. Paulinus of Nola describes the tonsure of the monk messenger who came to him from his friend in terms which would answer completely to the British tonsure.[2] Salvian also describes the tonsure of monks as being simply what we call a 'close crop'.[3]

The coronal tonsure was unknown in Britain and other places; its acceptance at Rome was comparatively late, so that in this again Britain was preserving the older custom.

[1] See Harnack in *Texte u. Untersuchungen*, pp. 213, 233.

[2] *Ep.* xxii. 2.

[3] *De Gub. Dei*, viii. 22 'Recussis comarum fluentium iubis usque ad cutem tonsum (monachum).'

Besides the disagreement in the one leading point of division, the Britons may have felt the irritation of having the whole of their religious life and service to God challenged, and the resulting resentment was strong.

We began with one faith, one Church; we close with one faith but two hostile Churches, the newer Church appropriating to itself alone the honoured name *Catholic*; the older, which had dwelt in the land more than 400 years, being regarded as non-Catholic.

INDEX

OF THE MOST IMPORTANT PROPER NAMES

Aaron, 103.
Adamnan, 282, 295.
Adrianople, Battle of, 167.
Agricola Pelagianus, 196, 209–10, 215, 220, 234.
Agricola, Sex. Calpurnius, 10 f., 16.
Aiduus, 297, 303.
Albanus, St., 55, 102–9.
Albinus, Clodius Septimus, 17, 75.
Aldhelm, 471.
Allectus, 4, 29, 110–12, 125.
Ambrose, St. (of Milan), 167–70, 173, 174, 179, 191.
Ambrosius, Aurelius, 182.
Ambrosius (Emrys Wledic), 332, 337.
Aneirin, 421, 427–8.
Annales Cambriae vel Brittonum, 404 ff.
Anthony, St., 252–4.
Antoninus, Wall of, 11.
Apollinaris, Sidonius, 3, 217–18, 223, 229, 239, 243, 455.
Apostles' Creed, 32 f.
Ariminum, Council of, 99, 160.
Aristobulus, 55.
Aristotle, 44–5.
Arles, Council of, 2, 78, 139–54.
Arthmael, 293.
Arthur, 349–52.
Arvandus, 282.
Asaph, St., 297, 393.
Asclepiodotus, 112, 116, 125.
Athanasius, 2, 98, 155, 259.
Augustalis, *Laterculus* of, 154, 465 f.
Augustine, St., 179, 181, 194, 197, 205–8, 257.
Augustine of Canterbury, 189–90, 441–6.
Aurelian, Paul, 288, 293, 297, 298, 317, 321, 379–80.
Aurelius, Marcus, 16, 101.

Bangor, 271–2.
Bangor-is-y-Coed, 200.
Bannauem Taberniae, 248.
Bassianus, 125.
Beda, 15 n., 62 f., 102, 104, 119, 147, 277, 295, 334, 464 f. *et passim.*
Benedict, Rule of, 402.
Benedict, St., 354–5.
Bertrand, M., 45, 48, 49.
Beuno, 297, 300.
Bible in British Church, 182–8, 447 ff.
Bignor, 6.
Bodotria, 10–11,
Boduni, 6–7.
Boniface, B. of Rome, 209.
Boresti, 11.
Boudica, 9.
Boulogne, 112.
Brân, 60.
Brendan, 297, 304.
Brigantes, 6, 8–9, 15.
Briocus, 230–1, 288, 289, 298, 308.
Bro Waroch, 279.
Brynach, 297, 300.

Caecilian, B. of Carthage, 140.
Caelestine, B. of Rome, 209, 211–12, 220.
Caermarthen, 32.
Caernarvon, 32.
Caerwent, 27, 31.
Caesar, Julius, 34, 40, 45–6.
Caesarius of Arles, 38, 39, 41–2.
Caldy (Calde), 323 ff.
Caledonia, -ii, 11, 17, 52.
Calleva, 27.
Camulodunum, 6, 9, 31.
Candida Casa, 245.
Capitolinus, 15–16.
Caracalla, 19.
Caractacus (Caradog), 6–7, 56.
Caranog, 297, 301.
Carausius, 4, 28, 110–12, 125.
Carthage, Council of, 208.
Cartismandua, 6–8.
Cassian, John, 240–2, 253, 256–7, 260, 268.
Cassiodorus, 19.
Cassius, Dio, 2, 4, 5–7, 12, 16 n., 17–19.
Catog, 297, 300, 319, 325, 359–61.
Cerealis, 9.
Chalcedon, Council of, 180.
Chollerton (Cilurnum), 21, 25, 26.
Chrysanthus, 175.
Chrysostom, Dio, 45.
Cicero, 44, 47.
Claudia, 57.
Claudian, 175.
Claudius, 1, 5, 50.
Clement of Alexandria, 45, 46.
Clement of Rome, 56.
Coelestius, 198, 203, 204, 207.

Cogidumnus, 6.
Coillus (Coel), 59.
Columba, 50–1, 242, 261, 400.
Comgall, 297, 304.
Commodus, 16.
Constans, 157–8.
Constans (a monk), 177–8.
Constantine I, 98, 113, 131–8.
Constantine, the Tyrant, 177 f., 344, 412.
Constantius II, 157 f.
Constantius, author of *Vita Germani*, 97, 98, 102, 104, 214–33, 295.
Constantius Chlorus, 29, 110–17.
Cornubia, 279, 287.
Culdees, 397.
Cunedda, 342 f.
Cuneglasus, 345.
Cunobelinus, 6.
Cybi, 297, 302, 396–7.
Cyprian, 68, 90–1, 102, 105.

Daniel (or Deiniol, of Bangor), 271–2, 312, 315, 394.
David, St. (Dewi Sant), 230, 231–2, 264, 272, 297, 301, 302–3, 317, 325, 380–91.
Decangi, 6.
Decius, 101–2.
Deorham, Battle of, 284.
Deva (Chester), 7–8, 13.
Diocletian, 28, 110–16.
Diognetum, Ep. ad, 68.
Diospolis, Synod of, 200–1, 207.
Disart (Dyserth), 271.
Dol, 291.
Donatus, 140.
Druidism, 8, 33, 43–53.
Dubricius, 233, 264, 296, 308–16, 319, 326.
Duchesne, M. l'Abbé, 54, 79, 278.
Dumnonia, 279, 291.
Durocornovium, 7.

Easter, observation of, 146–54, 463 ff.
Eborius, B. of York, 141.
Eburacum, 9, 12, 13, 18.
Eleuther, B. of Rome, 60–6.
Elvod, 405–6.
Enlli (Bardsey Is.), 398.
Eucherius, 240, 256, 314.
Euric, K. of the Visigoths, 283.
Eusebius, *H. E.*, 2, 71, 77, 97.
Eutropius, 19.

Fastidius, 181, 185, 234–8.
Faustus, B. of Riez, 229, 238–42, 243.
Felix, Minucius, 74.
Finian, or Finan, 297, 304, 371–2.
Florianus, 22.
Frontinus, 10.

Gallienus, 23–4.
Gallius, A. Didius, 7.
Gaul, 1, 3, 33, 36, 38.
Gennadius, 197, 202, 205, 234–5.
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 119–30 *et passim*.
Germanus of Auxerre, 191, 210, 214–33, 260, 306, 309, 326, 333, 335.
Gildas, 3, 15, 33–4, 41, 51, 52, 64, 91, 102–9, 118, 156, 170–1, 182–3, 226, 229, 231, 260–1, 264, 266, 272, 274, 277, 280–1, 284–5, 290, 298, 316–17, 318, 326, 332–52, 367 ff., 448.
Giraldus Cambrensis, 121, 301, 476 f.
Glastonbury, 325.
Glevum (Gloucester), 7, 31.
Gododin, kingdom of, 342.
Gratian, 167–70, 172.
Gregory of Tours, 180, 277, 281.
Gregory the Great, 189.
Guidnerth, 276, 301.
Guorthigirnus (Gwrtheyrn), 51, 333 f.
Gutrin, Ynis, 58, 325.
Gwenvrevi, 300, 303.
Gwynlliw, 297, 302.

Hadrian, 12 ff.
Hadrian, Wall of, 1, 13 ff., 19.
Harnack, 64–6, 72.
Helena, 116–17, 126–8.
Henllan, 312.
Henry of Huntingdon, 121, 127.
Hilary of Poitiers, 98–9, 158–64.
Himerius, B. of Tarragona, 193.
Hippolytus, 45, 46, 73, 97.
Historia Augusta, 2, 4.
Historia Lausiaca, 253.
Hodnant, 319–20, 327, 385.
Honoratus, 240, 256, 295.
Honorius, 177.
Hosius, 155–6, 158.
Housesteads, 16, 25.

Iceni, 6, 9.
Illtud, 230, 231–2, 264, 296, 302, 308–9, 310–12, 315, 316–31.
Innocent, B. of Rome, 208, 209, 220.
Irenaeus, 69, 79–80, 85, 91, 95.
Isca Silurum, 7–8, 13, 18, 20.
Isis, 19, 33.

Jerome, St., 81, 99–100, 179, 184, 190–1, 197, 199, 203, 236, 261, 262, 327.
Jerusalem, Synod of, 200, 201–2, 207.
Jonas, *Vita Columbani*, 304–5.
Joseph of Arimathea, 58–9.
Julian, 164–5.
Julius of Caerleon, 55.
Juvencus, Caius Vettius Aquilinus, 431–2.

Kentigern, 297, 303–4, 392–3.

Lactantius, 97, 131, 132.
Lan Aleth, 292.
Lapidarium Septentrionale, 5, 35.
Leo, B. of Rome (*Ep. Dogmatica*), 180, 192–3.
Lerins, 234, 238, 240, 249–50, 256–7, 258, 306–7.
Letavia (Llydaw), 280–1.
Liberius, B. of Rome, 158.
Lindum (Lincoln), 7.
Llanbadarn, -dudno, &c., 267–9.
Llandâv, Book of, 120, 265, 299, 300, 324, 356.
Llandâv, Church of, 124, 267, 309 f., 356 ff.
Llanddewivrevi, Synod of, 388.
Llanilltud, 290, 291, 302, 322–31.
Llansaint, -sant, -deusant, &c., 274–5.
Llywarch Hen, 425–7.
Loth, M., 278, 288.
Lucan, M. Anneus, 44, 47.
Lucius (Lles ap Coel), 59–66, 120.
Lupus, Virius, 17, 75.
Lupus of Troyes, 217, 222, 224–33, 307, 309.
Lyon (Lugdunum), 78, 158.

Maeatae, 11, 52.
Maelgwn Gwynedd, 287, 317–18, 333, 329 f.
Maesgarmon, 226.
Magnentius, 157–8.
Malo, St., 292, 298.
Manorbier, 323.
Mansuetus, 282.
Marcellinus, Ammianus, 2.
Marius (Meuruc), 59.
Marius Mercator, 197, 202, 204.
Marseilles, 234, 238–40, 250, 256–7, 258.
Martin, St., of Tours, 210, 216, 243, 244, 251, 257.
Maximian, 28, 110–13.
Maximinus Thrax, 101.
Maximus (Maxen Wledig), 169–76, 280, 283.
Maximus, Trebellius, 9.
Meirchion, 319.
Mela, Pomponius, 44, 47.
Melanius, 299.
Merlin or Merddin, 51, 123, 337 f.
Milan, Edict of, 134.
Mithra, 19–20, 33, 37.
Mona, 8 f.

Nennius, 63, 116, 119, 230, 231, 280, 334 *et passim*.
Nicaea, Faith of, in Britain, 155.
Niceta, 187–8, 258.
Ninocea, 288.
Nynias, 53, 244–5.

Old Latin Bible in Britain, 370.
Ordovices, 6, 9.
Origen, 2, 73, 96, 185.
Orosius, 19, 172, 176, 202.
Oudoceus, B. of Llandâv, 276, 297, 309.

Pachomius, 252, 253, 255.
Padarn, 297, 302–3.
Palladius, 78, 191, 210–13, 220, 261–3, 306–8.
Paris, Matthew, 122.
Patrick, St., 39, 50–3, 164, 185, 245–51, 306–7.
Paul, St., 55–6.
Paulinus of Nola, 258.
Pedrog, 297, 303.
Pelagius, 78, 164, 181, 185, 194, 196–213, 236–41, 447–8.
Peter, St., 55–6.
Picti, 11, 52, 165.
Pius, Antoninus, 15.
Plautius, Aulus, 5.
Pliny, 44, 48.
Postumianus, 180.
Postumus, M. Cassianus Latinius, 23, 24.
Pothinus, B. of Lyon, 85.
Probus, 22.
Prosper Tiro, 191, 198, 209, 210–12, 214, 217, 220–30, 241.
Pyrus (or Pirus), 323, 376.

Ratae (Leicester), 7.
Regni, 6.
Restitutus, B. of Lincoln, 141.
Ribchester, 16.
Ricemarchus (Rychmarch), 301, 380 f.
Riocatus, 239–40, 242–4, 309, 315–16, 355.
Riotimus, 283.
Roger of Wendover, 122.
Rosyn, Glyn (Rosina Vallis), 327, 385.
Rutilius, 3.

Samson, 230–2, 272, 287–8, 291, 296–8, 307–8, 316, 317, 320–1, 325, 375–9.
Sardica, Council of, 156, 192.
Sarn Helen, 32.
Scapula, P. Ostorius, 6, 7.
Scotti, 52.
Severianus, 196, 210.
Severus, Julius, 12.
Severus, Septimius, 13, 17–19, 31, 75, 101.
Severus, Sulpitius, 99, 161–2, 180, 250, 256–7, 295, 318.
Severus, B. of Trier, 228.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Siculus, Diodorus, 44, 45, 47.
Silures, 6, 9.
Simon Zelotes, 57.
Socrates, 2.
Sozomen, 2.
Strabo, 44, 47.
Suetonius Paulinus, 8–9.
Suetonius Tranquillus, 2, 4, 45.
Supputatio Romana, 466.
Symmachus, Q. Aurelius, 168–9.

Tacitus, 2, 4, 6, 45, 48.
Taliesin, 421 f., 428–30.
Teilo, 124, 286–7, 297, 309–10, 312, 357 f.
Tertullian, 2, 17, 69, 72–6, 79–81, 85–6, 90–6, 101, 155.
Theodosius, 166–8, 170, 174 f., 198.
Timagenes, 44, 47.
Togodumnus, 6, 56.
Tommen y Mur, 21.
Tours, Council of, 282.
Trajan, 12, 101.
Triads, 19 f.
Trinobantes, 6, 9.
Tudwal, 288, 292–3.
Turpilianus, Petronius, 9.

Urbicus, Q. Lollius, 15.
Ussher, Archbp., 260.
Uthur, 337.

Valerian, 23–4, 101–2.
Venutius, 7.
Veranius, A., 7.
Vergil, Polydore, 121, 129.
Verulamium, 104–5.
Vespasian, 9–10.
Victor, Aurelius, 19.
Victor, B. of Rome, 81, 94, 151.
Victorius, Canons of, 468.
Vincent of Lerins, 240–1.
Viroconium, 7, 26.
Vortigern (*see* Guorthigirnus), 231–2.

Walter, Archdeacon of Oxford, 122.
Warin the Briton, 122–3.
Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, 79, 83, 190.
Whitby, Synod of, 446, 470.
Wilfrid, 446, 470.
William of Malmesbury, 57, 121.
Winwalocus (or Guenolé), 286, 293–4, 298.

Xiphilinus, 4.

Zimmer, 61, 73, 79, 202, 205, 212, 330.
Zonaras, 4, 7.
Zosimus, 172, 176, 208, 209, 211–12.

Oxford : Horace Hart, M.A., Printer to the University

55575 283.02R W672
Williams, H
Christianity in early Britain

55575 283.02R W672